

Prophetic Stories as Sources for the Histories of Jehoshaphat and the Omrides

For many years, the Elijah-Elisha stories were regarded by scholars as pre-Deuteronomistic narrative cycles that the Deuteronomist (Dtr) integrated into his historical composition⁽¹⁾. As early as 1912, C. Steuernagel suggested that a considerable part of the stories in the Book of Kings (e.g., 1 Kgs 17,1–22,38; 2 Kgs 1,2–17; 2,1–25; 3,4–8,15; 9,1–10,28) were inserted only at a second stage of editing since they stand in marked contrast to the short descriptions of the original Dtr edition (Rd¹). For example, 1 Kgs 22,1–38 could not have been part of the Dtr history because they contradict verse 40. He concludes that out of the history of Ahab (1 Kgs 16,29–22,40) “für Rd¹ verbleiben höchstens 16,29–34, 22,39–40”⁽²⁾. G. Hölscher reached similar conclusions, noting that what is said in 1 Kgs 22,40, i.e. that Ahab “slept with his ancestors”, is used elsewhere only for kings who died in peace. Hence the story about Ahab’s violent death in 1 Kgs 22,1–38 was inserted later⁽³⁾. J.M. Miller took the same position some forty years later and suggested that the Elijah-Elisha legends and the accounts of the wars of the kings of Israel (1 Kgs 20;

(1) See e.g., A. ŠANDA, *Die Bücher der Könige übersetzt und erklärt*. I (Münster 1911) XXX, XLII; J.A. MONTGOMERY, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings* (ICC; Edinburgh 1951) 38–41; J. GRAY, *I and II Kings* (OTL; Philadelphia ²1970) 29–35, 358; O. EISSFELDT, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (Oxford 1965) 141–143, 290–299; A. WEISER, *The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development* (New York 1964) 175–179; M. NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (Tübingen ³1967) 78–80; A.D.H. MAYES, *The Story of Israel Between Settlement and Exile. A Redactional Study of the Deuteronomistic History* (London 1983) 106–132; A.F. CAMPBELL, *Of Prophets and Kings: A Ninth-Century Document (1 Samuel 1–2 Kings 10)* (Washington DC 1986).

(2) C. STEUERNAGEL, *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Alte Testament mit einem Anhang über die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen* (Tübingen 1912) 348–349, 362–363.

(3) G. HÖLSCHER, “Das Buch der Könige, seine Quellen und seine Redaktion”, *Eucharisterion* (FS. H. Gunkel [ed. H. SCHMIDT] FRLANT 19; Göttingen 1923) 184–186. See also R.H. PFEIFFER, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York 1941) 396–398, 403, 404–409.

22,1-38; 2 Kgs 3,4-27) were added to the Dtr history by a late redactor⁽⁴⁾. H.-C. Schmitt analysed the prophetic narratives in great detail and concluded that the four battle reports (1 Kgs 20; 22,1-38; 2 Kgs 3,4-27; 6,24-7,20) and the Elisha stories were inserted into the Book of Kings by a post-Dtr editor⁽⁵⁾. Since the 1980s this position, with many variants, has been supported by a growing number of scholars⁽⁶⁾. For example, S. L. McKenzie concludes that most of the long prophetic stories in the section from 1 Kings 13 to 2 Kings 13 are post-Dtr additions. These include the Elijah cycle in 1 Kgs 17-19, the story about Elijah in 2 Kgs 1,2-17aa, the battle accounts in 1 Kings 20 and 22,1-38, and the Elisha stories in 2 Kgs 2; 3,4-8,15; 13,14-21⁽⁷⁾. H.-J. Stipp concluded recently that "ein grosser Teil der Prophetenerzählungen in 1 Kön 13 – 2 Kön 13 erst nachträglich in das DtrG Eingang gefunden hat. Ursprünglich war das Werk in diesem Raum erheblich straffer und umfasste vor allem die Erzählungen, die durch das Dynastiewort ein unverkennbares dtr Gepräge erhalten haben (1 Kön 14; 21; 2 Kön 9ff.) oder unlöslich in das dtr Rahmenwerk eingeschmolzen sind (2 Kön 1)"⁽⁸⁾. The four battle reports (1 Kgs 20; 22,1-38; 2 Kgs 3,4-27; 6,24-7,20) and some of the Elisha narratives (2 Kgs 5; 6,8-23) were inserted into the Dtr history at a late stage of composition, possibly by the author of 1 Kgs 13 and 20,35-43⁽⁹⁾.

⁽⁴⁾ J. M. MILLER, "The Elisha Cycle and the Accounts of the Omride Wars", *JBL* 85 (1966) 449-451.

⁽⁵⁾ H.-C. SCHMITT, *Elisa. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur vorklassischen nordisraelitischen Prophetie* (Gütersloh 1972).

⁽⁶⁾ J. VAN SETERS, *In Search of History. Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History* (New Haven-London 1983) 305-306; E. WÜRTHWEIN, *Die Bücher der Könige. 1 Kön 17-2 Kön 25* (ATD 11,2; Göttingen 1984) 205, 496-498, 502-503; G. H. JONES, *1-2 Kings* (NCBC; Grand Rapids 1984) 338-339; H.-J. STIPP, *Elischa – Propheten – Gottesmänner: Die Kompositionsgeschichte des Elischazyklus und verwandter Texte, rekonstruiert auf der Basis von Text- und Literarkritik zu 1 Kön 20,22 und 2 Kön 2-7* (ATSAT 24; St. Ottilien 1987); A. ROFÉ, *The Prophetic Stories: The Narratives about the Prophets in the Hebrew Bible: Their Literary Types and History* (Jerusalem 1988); S. L. MCKENZIE, *The Trouble with Kings. The Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History* (VTS 42; Leiden 1991) 90-98.

⁽⁷⁾ MCKENZIE, *Trouble with Kings*, 98, 152.

⁽⁸⁾ H.-J. STIPP, "Ahabs Busse und die Composition des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks", *Bib* 76 (1995) 493.

⁽⁹⁾ STIPP, "Ahabs Busse", 489-493. For details, see STIPP, *Elischa*, 361-480.

The purpose of this article is to re-examine the problem of the integration of the prophetic narratives within the Dtr history from a new angle, not yet discussed by scholars. My analysis will focus on the problem of the sources available to the Dtr historian and the way that he drew conclusions on the basis of his sources. I believe that the study of sources is the key to the debate on the stage at which the prophetic stories first entered the Dtr historical composition.

I. The Concluding Statements on Judean and Israelite Kings

The concluding statements about the reign of Jehoshaphat open thus (*RSV*): "Now the rest of the acts of Jehoshaphat and his might (וְגִבּוּרָתוֹ) that he showed, and how he warred (וְאִשֶּׁר נִלָּחָם)... " (1 Kgs 22,45). What is the basis for saying that Jehoshaphat fought and showed his might? To answer this question, let me review the concluding statements on the reigns of other Israelite and Judean kings who are described in similar terms.

The combination of "his might" and "how he warred" appears only in the concluding statements on Jehoash (2 Kgs 14,15) and Jeroboam II (2 Kgs 14,28), kings of Israel. The textual basis for these remarks is clearly seen in their histories: Jehoash successfully fought the Arameans and later fought Amaziah, the king of Judah. Jeroboam II fought the Arameans and extended the Israelite border up to Lebo-Hamath (2 Kgs 14,25). The expression "how he warred" (אִשֶּׁר נִלָּחָם) alone appears in the closing statements on Jeroboam I (1 Kgs 14,19). Indeed, Jeroboam's early rebellion against Solomon (1 Kgs 11,26.40), his part in the episode of the division of the monarchy and his wars with Rehoboam "all their days" (1 Kings 14,30) are all related in the First Book of Kings.

References to the "might" (גִּבּוּרָה) of Israelite and Judean kings appear in the concluding statements of their reign. Asa's war against Baasha and Hezekiah's war against the Philistines and against Assyria fully explain the mention of "might" at the end of their reigns (1 Kgs 15,23; 2 Kgs 20,20). Baasha, Omri and Jehu rebelled against the reigning king of Israel, killed him and founded new dynasties. Their successful rebellions fully justified the mention of "might" in the concluding statements on their reigns (1 Kgs 16,5; 16,27; 2 Kgs 10,34). Baasha also fought against Asa of Judah and Ben-Hadad, the king of Aram (1 Kgs 15,16-20). Jehu fought against

Hazael, the king of Aram (2 Kgs 10,32-33). His son, Jehoahaz, fought against Hazael, the king of Aram, and against his son, Ben-Hadad, "for many years" (2 Kgs 13,3.7.22). The emphasis on his "might" in the concluding statements on his reign (2 Kgs 13,8) is self-explanatory.

We have seen that for each king whose reign is summarized by a reference to his fighting, his might, or both, the Dtr relates in some detail the historical basis of the reference. In the case of Jehoshaphat, he used the double statement, which, as we have seen, was used only in the case of a few successful kings (Jehoash and Jeroboam II of Israel). What are the wars in which Jehoshaphat participated and in which he showed his might? The only reasonable answer is that the text refers to his participation in the campaigns against the Arameans and the Moabites related in 1 Kgs 22,1-38 and 2 Kgs 3,4-27. In other words, contrary to the opinion of the above-mentioned scholars, the two narratives must have been included in the Dtr history and formed the basis for the historian's concluding statements on Jehoshaphat.

Scholars may object to this conclusion and argue that reference to fighting and/or might is absent from the concluding statements on Ahab, king of Israel. However, it was always used for kings who triumphed in war (Jehoahaz may be an exception), whereas Ahab was killed in battle and his army retreated. Moreover, the Dtr was not a modern western historian who systematically inserted remarks about might and fighting in every appropriate place. Thus it does not appear in the histories of Menahem and Pekah who successfully rebelled against their lords and seized the throne. It is also missing from the concluding statements on Judean kings who either fought and won in battle (David and Amaziah, who subjugated Edom), or successfully withstood a coalition of enemies (Ahaz). The absence of any reference to war in the concluding statements on Ahab in no way contradicts my conclusion that 1 Kgs 22,1-38 and 2 Kgs 3,4-27 formed part of the original Dtr history.

Other elements in the concluding statements on Israelite and Judean kings also appear in their respective histories. The reference to Solomon's deeds "and his wisdom" (1 Kgs 11,41) is broadly illustrated in the history of that king. The observation regarding all that Manasseh did "and the sin that he committed" (2 Kgs 21,17) is fully illuminated by his history. The reference to the acts of Jeroboam I, "how he warred and how he reigned", summarises his

history. The remarks on the "conspiracy which he made" (וקשרו אשר קשר) for Zimri (1 Kgs 16,20) and Shallum (2 Kgs 15,15) refer back to their histories.

References to the building of cities or other special building operations appear infrequently in the concluding remarks of the Book of Kings. Indeed, building operations do not appear in the concluding statements on kings whose histories mention such operations (e.g., Jeroboam I, Omri, Joash, Amaziah, Uzziah, Jotham). Of the three extant accounts the building of cities in the concluding statement on Asa (1 Kgs 15,23) is known from his history (v. 22). What is said about Hezekiah "and how he made the pool and the conduit and brought water into the city" (2 Kgs 20,20) is not related in that king's history. But the historian lived in Jerusalem about a century after the completion of the operation, when its memory was still very much alive. The source for Hezekiah's operation is oral rather than documentary. The only concluding statement whose details are not related in the king's history appears in 1 Kgs 22,39: "Now the rest of the acts of Ahab, and all that he did, and the ivory house which he built, and all the cities that he built ..." ⁽¹⁰⁾.

Does this isolated reference indicate that the Dtr did not use all his sources and sometimes referred to them only in the concluding remarks about a reign? Or did he draw the conclusion on Ahab's building and luxury (i.e., ivory) from the prophetic stories of his dynasty? These narratives emphasize the prominent position of the cities of Samaria and Jezreel and refer to the building of the palace (or palaces) of Ahab and the House of Ba'al. The historian may have inferred from these stories that Ahab built cities and decorated his palace with furniture inlaid with ivory. Certainty cannot be achieved in this matter. But in the light of what was said about the concluding statements on all other kings of Israel and Judah, the assumption of logical inferences on the basis of the extant sources should not be lightly dismissed.

To sum up, the concluding statements on the deeds of Judean and Israelite kings were written on the basis of sources available to the Dtr historian. These remarks are addressed to the readers and

⁽¹⁰⁾ An enigmatic concluding statement appears at the close of Jeroboam II's reign (2 Kgs 14,28). For a suggested new solution for this crux and for earlier literature, see N. NA'AMAN, "Azariah of Judah and Jeroboam II of Israel", *VT* 43 (1993) 230-231.

convey the message that the history they read was composed on the basis of written sources, thus validating its authenticity. "The Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel" and "the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah" must have been real sources from which the Dtr drew certain information. But the range of sources available to him was much broader. The Dtr worked and integrated his sources into his composition, wrote his own text on the basis of their words (for further details, see below) and referred briefly to his sources in the concluding statements about each reign. To facilitate reference to the mixed sources available to him, he referred to all his source-material as "the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel/Judah".

II. Jehoshaphat's Righteousness

It is said of Jehoshaphat that "he walked in all the way of Asa his father; he did not turn aside from it, doing what was right in the sight of the Lord" (1 Kgs 22,43a). The details of the reform attributed to him (v.46) could hardly have been drawn from a source. The text was written in conjunction with the list of the religious sins of the Kingdom of Judah following the division of the monarchy (1 Kgs 14,24a; see 15,12a).

On what basis did the Dtr decide that Jehoshaphat was a righteous king? Since he "made peace" with the king of Israel (1 Kgs 22,44), took Athaliah, the daughter of Omri/Ahab, as wife for his son, Jehoram (2 Kgs 8,18.26), and went to war with Ahab and Joram, the kings of Israel (1 Kgs 22,1-38; 2 Kgs 3,4-27), the historian had good reasons to describe him unfavourably. Indeed, Jehoram, his son, and Ahaziah, his grandson, were described unfavourably on account of their close relations with the dynasty of Omri (2 Kgs 8,18.27).

Some scholars note that there is a literary pattern in the numbers of evil/righteous kings that unified the Dtr value-judgments regarding the kings of Judah⁽¹⁾. However, from the religious point of view, this pattern is meaningless and is no more than a literary embellishment. I very much doubt the assumption that the

⁽¹⁾ WÜRTHEIN, *Bücher der Könige*, 492-495; E. BEN-ZVI, "The Account of the Reign of Manasseh in II Reg 21,1-18 and the Redactional History of the Book of Kings", *ZAW* 103 (1991) 359-361.

attribution of evil or righteousness to the majority of the kings was arbitrary, and inspired by a (theologically meaningless) literary pattern. The Dtr must have had particular reasons for deciding whether kings were religiously "good" or "bad". It seems to me that most of the value-judgments were established either on the basis of information drawn from sources, or, in the case of Manasseh, Amon and Josiah, from the author's personal knowledge. The pattern must have been created by fitting some kings whose cultic deeds remained obscure (e.g., Abiam, Amaziah, Uzziah, Jotham) into the value-judgment on the other kings whose valuation was based on literary sources and orally-transmitted knowledge.

It seems to me that the Dtr value-judgment on Jehoshaphat was drawn from the prophetic stories of 1 Kgs 22,1-38 and 2 Kgs 3,4-27. In the former narrative, Jehoshaphat initiates the inquiry into the word of YHWH (v. 5), remains unconvinced by the unanimous answer of the 400 prophets and calls for another inquiry (vv. 7-8); and when he is in trouble in war, he "cried out" (v. 32), which the Chronicler at any rate interprets as a call for God's help (2 Chr 18,31). In the latter narrative (2 Kgs 3) he again initiates the inquiry into YHWH's word spoken by a prophet (v. 11) and announces the divine inspiration of Elisha (v. 12 "The word of the Lord is with him"); his fame as devotee of YHWH convinces Elisha to prophesy (v. 14). The devotion of Jehoshaphat to YHWH as related in the two stories outweighs the negative conclusions that the Dtr might have drawn from his relations with the sinful kings of Israel. He is therefore described favourably in the opening remarks on his reign.

Two analogous examples may be brought in support of this analysis. The extremely positive value-judgment regarding Hezekiah (2 Kgs 18,3-5) was inferred from his religious conduct as reflected in the old story of the Assyrian siege of Jerusalem and the city's miraculous deliverance (2 Kgs 18,17-19,9a.36). The positive value-judgment concerning Joash, the king of Judah (2 Kgs 12,3-4); was inferred from the story of his assumption of the throne of Judah (2 Kgs 11) and from the report of the restoration of the temple under his supervision (2 Kgs 12,5-13).

We may conclude that narratives available about certain kings of Judah played a major role in the Dtr value-judgments about these kings and that the narratives in 1 Kgs 22,1-38 and 2 Kgs 3,4-27

played a decisive role in establishing the value-judgment regarding Jehoshaphat⁽¹²⁾.

III. The Value-Judgments on Ahab, Ahaziah and Joram

The religious misdeeds of Ahab are described in detail in 1 Kgs 16,30-33. No other Israelite ruler is described so pejoratively; his sins are later compared with those of Manasseh, the arch-sinner in the history of Judah (2 Kgs 21,3.13; see 2 Kgs 8,18.27; Mic 6,16). What could have been the sources from which the Dtr drew the details of Ahab's sins and which led him to conclude that his religious misdeeds were worse than those of all other Israelite kings?

The answer is obvious: the Dtr had before him the prophetic narratives of Elijah (1 Kgs 17-19) and of Jehu's rebellion (2 Kgs 9-10). From these sources he drew logical conclusions about Ahab's cultic misdeeds and related them in 1 Kgs 16,30-33. These included the building of a temple to Ba'al in Samaria (2 Kgs 10,18-27), the worship of Ba'al by the king and his people (1 Kgs 18-19) and hence the king's negative attitude towards the cult of YHWH. He naturally connected it with Ahab's marriage with Jezebel, of which he learned from these and other sources. The Dtr description of the sins of Ahab (1 Kgs 16,30-33) is the logical conclusion drawn from the source-material available to him.

The negative evaluation of Ahaziah, the son of Ahab (1 Kgs 22,63-64), was based on the prophetic narrative in 2 Kgs 1,2-17aa and the assumed continuity between father and son. Recently some scholars have suggested a pre-Dtr date for the narrative of Elijah and Ahaziah⁽¹³⁾, emphasizing that the absence of Dtr editing in a certain narrative does not indicate a post-Dtr date for its inclusion in the history⁽¹⁴⁾. Indeed, the assumption that the Dtr did not

⁽¹²⁾ For the background of the negative value-judgments on Ahaz and Jehoiakim, see N. NA'AMAN, "The Deuteronomist and Voluntary Servitude to Foreign Powers", *JSOT* 65 (1995) 37-53.

⁽¹³⁾ W. THIEL, "Deuteronomistische Redaktionsarbeit in den Elia-Erzählungen", *VT* 43 (1991) 156-158; STIPP, "Ahabs Busse", 476.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Note Stipp's remark ("Ahabs Busse", 476): "Das Fehlen dtr Merkmale ist daher kein Argument für einen späteren Einbau ins DtrG". This is contrary to McKenzie's view (*Trouble with Kings*, 86, 92, 97). He considers the lack of Dtr language and themes an important argument for assigning a post-Dtr date to prophetic stories.

integrate sources unless he worked upon them lacks concrete foundation. The historian must have integrated the narrative of 2 Kgs 1,2-17aa into his composition and at the same time used it as a basis for Ahaziah's value-judgment⁽¹⁵⁾.

The Dtr value-judgment on Joram, the son of Ahab, runs as follows: "He did what was evil in the sight of the Lord, though not like his father and mother, for he put away the pillar of Ba'al which his father had made" (2 Kgs 3,2). Verse 2a is the inversion of the value-judgment on Ahaziah, his brother, who "served Ba'al and worshiped him, and provoked the Lord ... to anger in every way that his father had done" (1 Kgs 22,53). How should we account for the statement about Joram which set him apart from his parents and his brother?

It seems to me that here too the difference derives from the sources that the historian ascribed to Joram's reign and upon which he based his judgment. Among them was the story of the campaign against Moab (2 Kgs 3), in which Joram insisted on consulting Elisha and was not put off by the prophet's initial refusal (v. 13). In the story-cycle of Elisha, which the historian assigns to the time of Joram, the king of Israel stood close to Elisha and treated him with respect (e.g., 2 Kgs 6,8-10.21-22; 8,4-6). Finally, Joram is not accused of any misdeed in the story of Jehu's rebellion (2 Kgs 9). His slaying is explained as a fulfilment of the divine prophecy about Ahab, made after the murder of Naboth and his sons (vv. 25-26). In the light of the source-material attributed to the reign of Joram, the Dtr naturally drew the conclusion that the religious situation in his time had improved when compared to the state of affairs in the days of Ahab and Ahaziah.

The remark about Joram's removal of the "pillar of Ba'al which his father had made" (2 Kgs 3,2b) contradicts other remarks in the Book of Kings. Ahab is not accused of erecting a pillar of Ba'al; and moreover, the breaking-up of the pillar of Ba'al is explicitly mentioned in the story of Jehu's cultic reform (2 Kgs 10,26-27). The source for the reform attributed to Joram remains unknown (for contradictory statements in the Dtr history, see below).

⁽¹⁵⁾ For a recent discussion of the unity of 2 Kgs 1,2-17a, see C. T. BEGG, "Unifying Factors in 2 Kings 1.2-17a", *JSOT* 32 (1985) 75-86, with earlier literature in p. 85, n. 2.

In conclusion, the close correspondence between the prophetic stories and the Dtr value-judgments on Jehoshaphat and the Omrides indicates that the historian based his statements on these stories. A pre-Dtr date for these compositions is self-evident.

IV. The Pre-Dtr Story of Ahab's Death in Battle (1 Kgs 22,1-18.29-37)

A pre-Dtr date of composition and an inclusion in the original Dtr history for 1 Kgs 17-19, 2 Kgs 1,2-17aa, 2 Kgs 3,4-27 and 2 Kgs 9-10, is not fraught with serious problems. The attempt to date the inclusion of Elisha's prophetic narratives (2 Kgs 4,1-8,15) in the Dtr work is not furthered by the present discussion, except for their possible bearing on the value-judgment on Joram, the son of Ahab. The story of 1 Kgs 20 bears various characteristics of a late, post-Dtr composition, and I intend to discuss its date and sources in another place.

On the other hand, assigning a pre-Dtr date to the story of Ahab's death in battle (1 Kgs 22,1-38) and attributing its integration into the history to the Dtr, pose serious problems⁽¹⁶⁾. First, Elijah's words in 1 Kgs 21,19b ("in the place where dogs licked up the blood of Naboth shall dogs lick your own blood") are not accurately fulfilled, since Naboth was executed in Jezreel (1 Kgs 21,8-14), whereas Ahab's blood was licked in Samaria (1 Kgs 22,38aa). Moreover, no known prophecy about Ahab predicted that harlots would wash themselves in his blood (22,38aß). Many scholars have therefore suggested that verse 38 was inserted by a later hand in order to connect Ahab's death in battle with the prophetic words in 1 Kgs 21,19b⁽¹⁷⁾.

⁽¹⁶⁾ For a discussion of 1 Kgs 22,1-38, see the list of literature in M. REHM, *Das erste Buch der Könige: Ein Kommentar* (Würzburg 1979) 213; B. O. LONG, *1 Kings with an Introduction to Historical Literature* (FOTL 9; Grand Rapids, MI 1984) 239-240; STIPP, "Ahabs Busse", 491, n. 47. See also B. O. LONG, "The Form and Significance of 1 Kings 22:1-38", *Isac Leo Seeligmann Volume III* (eds. A. ROFÉ-Y. ZAKOVITCH) (Jerusalem 1983) 193-208; STIPP, *Elischa*, 152-229; S. J. DE VRIES, "The Three Comparisons in 1 Kings XXII 4b and Its Parallel and 2 Kings III 7b", *VT* 39 (1989) 283-306; J. M. HAMILTON, "Caught in the Nets of Prophecy? The Death of King Ahab and the Character of God", *CBQ* 56 (1994) 649-663.

⁽¹⁷⁾ See e.g., I. BENZINGER, *Die Bücher der Könige erklärt* (KHCAT;

Secondly, there is the famous contradiction between the account that Ahab died in battle (1 Kgs 22,34-37) and the statement that he “slept with his ancestors” (v.40). For this reason, most scholars assume that the narrative was inserted into the history by a post-Dtr editor⁽¹⁸⁾.

Was the story of Ahab’s death in battle a pre-Dtr composition that was integrated by the Dtr into his history? Or was it inserted by a post-Dtr editor? The following is a discussion aimed at demonstrating that the first alternative is better founded.

The narrative in 1 Kgs 22,1-37 describes the circumstances that lead to the death of Ahab in battle. Contrary to the suggestions of some scholars⁽¹⁹⁾, the narrative looks quite unified⁽²⁰⁾, except for the passage in verses 19-28, which shifts the focus of the story from its main course (i.e., Micaiah’s prophecy and its fulfilment) to a

Leipzig – Tübingen 1899) 125; R. KITTEL, *Die Bücher der Könige* (HKAT; Göttingen 1900) 178-179; ŠANDA, *Bücher der Könige*, 500-501; MONTGOMERY, *Books of Kings*, 341; W. DIETRICH, *Prophetie und Geschichte* (Göttingen 1972) 49-50; LONG, “Form and Significance”, 206-208.

⁽¹⁸⁾ See notes 2-6 above: M.A. O’BRIEN, *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment* (OBO 92; Freiburg – Göttingen 1989) 201-203.

⁽¹⁹⁾ E. WÜRTHWEIN, “Zur Komposition von IReg 22:1-38”, *Das ferne und nahe Wort* (FS. L. Rost [ed. F. Maass] BZAW 105; Berlin 1967). For a criticism of Würthwein’s analysis of 1 Kgs 22,1-38, see LONG, “Form and Significance”, 193-197. STIPP, *Elischa*, 176-229, finds a total of six layers in the chapter, and H. WEIPPERT, “Ahab el campeador? Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu 1 Kön 22”, *Bib* 69 (1988) 457-479, finds five levels of composition and additions. Long’s criticism of Würthwein’s work is equally true for Stipp’s and Weippert’s textual analysis. The original narrative (vv.1-18. 29-37) follows the pattern of other biblical “battle reports”. The motif of disguise in an effort to escape a destined fate is central to the plot and depends on an early prophecy which declared the king’s fate. The author combined various motifs that have parallels in other biblical texts (see WEIPPERT, “Ahab el campeador?”, 466-469), but the narrative he produced is coherent and unified. I very much doubt the compositional layers theory according to which an originally short *Grunderzählung* was gradually expanded by the addition of various supplements and insertions.

⁽²⁰⁾ WÜRTHWEIN, “Komposition”, 246, suggested that the original story opened in verse 2b. STIPP, *Elischa*, 217-219 and WEIPPERT, “Ahab el campeador?”, 460-462, assumed that the *Grunderzählung* opened in verse 3. For the originality of verse 1, compare Judg 9,22; 2 Sam 13,38; 1 Kgs 2,39; see SCHMITT, *Elisa*, 45, n. 52.

side-track (the problems of the source of the spirit and of true versus false prophecy). In my opinion, verses 19-28 were written and inserted by the Dtr and reflect conflicts and debates that were current in his own time⁽²¹⁾. The insertion theory also explains some loose ends in the plot (e.g., no mention of the fates of Micaiah and Zedekiah after the battle). Ahab is mentioned only in verse 20, which is part of the Dtr addition. It is thus suggested that the king of Israel was first identified by name when the story was integrated into the Dtr history (for further clarification, see below).

There are several cases where the Dtr added to an earlier story, inserting his own text. For example, in 1 Kgs 11 he added to the pre-Dtr story of Jeroboam's rebellion against Solomon (vv. 26-28) by inserting his own description of a meeting between the prophet and the would-be king that culminates with Ahijah's prophecy (vv. 29-39) but left intact the ending of the episode (v. 40). The pre-Dtr narrative of Ahijah and Jeroboam's wife was cut in two places where the Dtr inserted his own doom prophecies (vv. 7-11.14-16). The earlier ending of the story appears in vv. 17-18. In 1 Kgs 21, the Dtr interrupted the story of Naboth's vineyard (vv. 1-19b) and inserted his own doom prophecy (vv. 20b-24 [or 20b-22.24], and possibly 27-29; see below)⁽²²⁾. The Dtr interpolation in 1 Kgs 22 is typical of the way he worked with his sources by inserting passages that conveyed his belief in the course of history and sent ideological and religious messages to his readers.

(²¹) For the religious background of verses 18-25, see the commentaries; S.J. DE VRIES, *Prophet Against Prophet: The Role of the Micaiah Narrative (1 Kgs 22) in the Development of Early Prophetic Tradition* (Grand Rapids, MI 1978) 40-47, 141-150; ROFÉ, *Prophetic Stories*, 142-152; HAMILTON, "Caught in the Nets", 649-663, with earlier literature.

(²²) Most critics consider 1 Kgs 21,20b-24 (or 20b-22.24) to be Dtr. See e.g., ŠANDA, *Bücher der Könige*, 466-469; DIETRICH, *Prophetie und Geschichte*, 48-50; MCKENZIE, *Trouble with Kings*, with earlier literature; H.N. WALLACE, "The Oracles Against the Israelite Dynasties in 1 and 2 Kings", *Bib* 67 (1986) 30-31; THIEL, "Dtr Redaktionsarbeit", 159-165. For other suggestions, see S. TIMM, *Die Dynastie Omri. Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Israels im 9. Jahrhundert vor Christus* (FRLANT 124; Göttingen 1982) 126-131; M. OEMING, "Naboth, der Jesreeliter: Untersuchungen zu den theologischen Motiven der Überlieferungsgeschichte von 1 Reg 21", *ZAW* 98 (1986) 363-364.

The structure of the original story follows a threefold pattern⁽²³⁾:

- (1) Situation and agreement to wage war (vv. 1-4)
- (2) Consultation with prophets (vv. 5-18)
- (3) The battle and its outcome (vv. 29-37).

The original story focuses on the fate of the Israelite king. It describes the decision of the two kings to go to battle, the requests for oracle and Micaiah's prophecy of doom, the king's attempt to avert the prophesied fate by fighting in disguise and how the destined fate finally overtook him.

Ahab's disguise in battle and the transfer of his identity as royal commander to Jehoshaphat is closely related to the ancient Near Eastern concept of a "substitute king"⁽²⁴⁾. The need for a substitute king arose from evil omens portending the death of the king. He would therefore temporarily abdicate his throne, give up his authority and titles, and dress as an ordinary man, while a substitute took his place. After a predetermined period he was put to death, thereby fulfilling the prediction. Once the threat to the king was averted, he was reinstalled on the throne.

Ahab's death in battle in spite of his disguise and Jehoshaphat's escape from the fate of a substitute King have a parallel in the Babylonian "Chronicle of Early Kings":

Erra-imitti, the king, installed Enlil-bani, the gardener, as a substitute king on his throne. He placed the royal diadem on his head. Erra-imitti [died] in his palace when he sipped some hot broth. Enlil-bani, who occupied the throne, did not give it up (and) so was sovereign⁽²⁵⁾.

The pre-Dtr story of Ahab's doom prophecy and his failure to evade his destined fate draw on well-known motifs and beliefs that were particularly widespread in the Assyrian empire during the reign of Esarhaddon, king of Assyria (680-669 BCE)⁽²⁶⁾.

⁽²³⁾ LONG, "Form and Significance", 196; id., *1 Kings*, 230-237.

⁽²⁴⁾ For the Mesopotamian idea of a "substitute king" (*šar pūḫi*) and its classical and Arabian parallels, see J. BOTTERO, "Le substitut royal et son sort en Mésopotamie ancienne", *Akkadica* 9 (1978) 2-24; S. PARPOLA, *Letters from Assyrian Scholars to the Kings Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal*. II. *Commentary and Appendices* (AOAT 5/2; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1983) XXII-XXXII, with earlier literature. For the Hittite ritual, see H. M. KÜMMEL, *Ersatzrituale für den hethitischen König* (StBoT 3; Wiesbaden 1967).

⁽²⁵⁾ A. K. GRAYSON, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (Texts from Cuneiform Sources V; Locust Valley, NY 1975) 155, lines 31-36.

⁽²⁶⁾ PARPOLA, *Letters from Assyrian Scholars*, XXII-XXVIII and elsewhere;

The story in 1 Kgs 22,1-18.29-37 may originally have been attached to the story of 2 Kgs 3,4-27. The Israelite king's death in the battle of Ramoth-Gilead may have formed the background for Mesha's rebellion which opened the story of 2 Kgs 3. As noted by scholars, several elements are common to the two narratives⁽²⁷⁾:

- (1) Both are "battle reports" and share a similar threefold structure: (a) The situation and the agreement to join forces and go to war. (b) The consultation with a prophet or prophets. (c) The account of a battle and its outcome.
- (2) In both stories it is the king of Israel who invites Jehoshaphat, the king of Judah, to join him and go to battle, and Jehoshaphat responds in identical words (1 Kgs 22,4; 2 Kgs 3,7).
- (3) In both stories the allies initiate a campaign against an eastern neighbouring kingdom (Aram and Moab), and the results of the campaign are unfavourable to the king of Israel.
- (4) Jehoshaphat is favourably portrayed in the two episodes of the consultation with prophets (1 Kgs 22,5,7; 2 Kgs 3,11-12,14). Moreover, his request to consult a prophet of YHWH is delivered in almost identical words (1 Kgs 22,7; 2 Kgs 3,11).
- (5) The prophecy given by a prophet of YHWH and its fulfilment are the focus of the two narratives.

In view of the common elements of the two narratives and the favorable light in which the king of Judah is described, we may assume that they were composed in Jerusalem by a single author. This author had before him certain stories about the sins of Ahab and Jezebel (note 2 Kgs 3,13), as well as other sources concerning Jehoshaphat's alliance with the kings of Israel, and about Mesha's rebellion. He wrote what may be presumed to be the two-part narrative of Jehoshaphat and the Omrides by filling in the gaps and characterising the royal figures according to his ideological and

H. SPIECKERMANN, *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit* (FRLANT 129; Göttingen 1982) 289-292.

(27) H. SCHWEIZER, *Elischa in den Kriegen: Literaturwissenschaftliche Untersuchung von 2 Kön 3; 6,8-23; 6,24-7,20* (München 1974) 32-35; J. R. BARTLETT, "The 'United' Campaign against Moab in 2 Kings 3:4-27", *Midian, Moab and Edom* (eds. J. F. A. SAWYER – D. J. A. CLINES) (Sheffield 1983) 135-146; STIPP, *Elischa*, 67-71, 152-158; WEIPPERT, "Ahab el campeador?", 466-469.

artistic aims. The identity of the slain Israelite king (i.e., Ahab) is disclosed to the reader only at the beginning of the second scene, when the identity of Jehoshaphat's second ally (i.e., Joram) is given (2 Kgs 3,5-6).

This two-scene narrative was part of the stock stories that were copied and studied in some school in Jerusalem. When the Dtr wrote his historical composition he integrated these stories into this work⁽²⁸⁾. He may have split the narrative and attached its parts to the histories of Ahab and Joram.

It is well known that the Dtr wrote a series of prophecies to anticipate events about which he had learned from his sources. The prophecies demonstrate his idea of history as a series of fulfilment of the word of YHWH⁽²⁹⁾. One of his stories that were generally known describes in detail Jehu's rebellion and the end of the dynasty of Omri. To explain the extremely violent end of the dynasty, he cut short the story of Naboth's vineyard, wrote Elijah's doom prophecies (vv. 20b-24 [or 20b-22.24] and inserted them after v. 19b. In the context of the Dtr history these prophecies are fulfilled by the death of Joram and Jezebel and the annihilation of all members of the dynasty (2 Kgs 9-10). To tighten the connection between prophecies and their fulfilment, he inserted descriptions of the fulfilment into the story of Jehu's rebellion (9,7-10.25b-26.36-37; 10,10-11,17).

The pre-Dtr story of Ahab's death in battle posed a special problem for the Dtr's scheme of prophecy and fulfilment. On the one hand, he wanted to integrate it, along with all other sources, into his history, but on the other hand, he needed to avoid the conclusion that Ahab's death in battle was the punishment referred to in Elijah's doom prophecy. To meet both requirements, the Dtr left aside verse 19b of 1 Kgs 21, in which the personal punishment for Ahab is explicitly expressed, and appended the doom prophecies in 1 Kgs 21,20b-24 with a passage (vv. 27-29) that states that "the evil" will not come in Ahab's days: "but in his son's days I will

⁽²⁸⁾ N. NA'AMAN, "Sources and Composition in the History of David", *The Origins of the Ancient Israelite States* (eds. V. FRITZ - P. R. DAVIES) (JSOTSS 228; Sheffield 1996) 180-183.

⁽²⁹⁾ G. VON RAD, "The Deuteronomistic Theology of History in the Books of Kings", *Studies in Deuteronomy* (London 1953) 74-92; WALLACE, "Oracles", 21-40.

bring the evil upon his house" (v.29)⁽³⁰⁾. The passage did not exclude a personal punishment for Ahab; it only stated that "the evil" — that is, the end of the dynasty — is postponed and will take place in the next generation. YHWH's words in verse 29 ("I will bring the evil upon his house") were deliberately formulated by the Dtr and, together with verse 19b, leave room for the personal fate of Ahab as narrated in 1 Kgs 22. The author's aim was grasped by the interpolator of 1 Kgs 22,38, and he combined the death of Ahab directly with the prophecy in 1 Kgs 21,19b.

There remains the problem of 1 Kgs 22,40. Death and burial formulae of the Omride and Jehuite kings who died peacefully combine lying with the ancestors and burial in Samaria (1 Kgs 16,28; 2 Kgs 10,35; 13,9; 13,13; 14,16; 14,29). 1 Kgs 22,40 is an exception and mentions only the lying with the ancestors, whereas burial in Samaria closes the story of Ahab's death in battle (v. 37). It is evident that the concluding formula in v.40 presumes that the narrative is already known and, to avoid repetition, omits the second half of the formula.

It is well known that the statement "slept with his ancestors" appears only for kings who died peacefully. However, no Israelite or Judean king other than Ahab was killed in battle. Moreover, according to the Book of Kings, the Israelite kings who died violent deaths were left unburied, unlike Ahab who was buried in Samaria (v. 37). We may assume that either the Dtr made Ahab an exception and did not count his courageous death in battle among the other violent deaths, or that he made a mistake and erroneously appended the statement to his reign (v. 40).

There are some other internal contradictions in the Dtr history of the Omrides. First, the story of Naboth's death in 1 Kgs 21 is entirely different from the account in 2 Kgs 9,25-26⁽³¹⁾. Second, the

⁽³⁰⁾ For the debate on the date of composition of verses 27-29, see STIPP, "Ahabs Busse", 477-489, with earlier literature.

⁽³¹⁾ I.L. SEELIGMANN, "Die Auffassung von der Prophetie in der deuteronomistischen und chronistischen Geschichtsschreibung", VTS 29 (1978) 260-262; A. ROFÉ, "The Vineyard of Naboth: The Origin and Message of the Story", VT 38 (1988) 95-97; H.G.M. WILLIAMSON, "Jezreel in the Biblical Texts", Tel Aviv 18 (1991) 84-85. Some scholars suggest that verses 25-26 were interpolated into the original story of Jehu's rebellion. See e.g., J.C. TREBOLLE-BARRERA, *Jehu y Joás: Texto y composición literaria de 2 Reyes 9-11* (Institución San Jerónimo 17; Valencia 1984) 162-163; M. MULZER, *Jehu schlägt Joram*. Text-, literar- und

emphasis on the prohibition of selling patrimony in the story of Naboth markedly contradicts the statement that Shemer sold Samaria to Omri (1 Kgs 16,24). Third, the place of the king of Edom in the story of 2 Kgs 3,4-27 contradicts both statements that there was no king in Edom in the time of Jehoshaphat (1 Kgs 22,48) and that the first king of Edom was installed in the time of his son, Jehoram (2 Kgs 8,20). Fourth, the statement that Joram, the son of Ahab, removed the pillar of Ba'al (2 Kgs 3,2) contradicts the explicit statement that the pillar of Ba'al stood in the temple until it was broken up in the course of Jehu's reform (2 Kgs 10,26-27).

This series of contradictions between narratives and the parts of history written by the Dtr is taken by scholars as an indication of a post-Dtr date of integration into the Dtr history. It seems to me that the essential defect in this view is the attribution of modern historical standards to authors whose approach was quite different. Unlike the modern historian, biblical authors and editors were never systematic in their work and sometimes left contradictory statements in place⁽³²⁾. It goes without saying that an uneven text may indicate later editorial intervention, but we must take into account the possibility that certain contradictions are merely the result of uneven work by an author/editor.

All the contradictions presented above are, in my opinion, the result of the work of the Dtr using his sources. On the one hand, he integrated into his work a series of prophetic stories and "battle reports" with almost no intervention, except for the systematic insertion of doom prophecies and statements of fulfilment, or certain textual additions and expansions. On the other hand, he wrote his historical accounts on the basis of these narratives and other sources that came down to him. What look to us like contradictions did not necessarily look that way to this author, nor

strukturkritische Untersuchung zu 2Kön 8,25–10,36 (ATSAT 37; St. Ottilien 1992) 234-236, 290, 302.

⁽³²⁾ I.L. SEELIGMANN, "Researches into the Criticism of the Massoretic Text of the Bible", *Tarbiz* 25 (1956) 123 [Hebrew], observes that "there is no consistency in this tendentious replacement of words, nor is there consistency in all the processes of reworking in the MT, or even in the LXX". In note 20 he notes that "after many years of profound study I have learned that there are processes of reworking in the MT, but they do not manifest any degree of consistency (and the same is true of the many text reworkings in the LXX)".

to early readers of the history. It is thus possible that the historian and his readers did not notice the contradiction between 1 Kgs 22,34-37 and 40 or the other contradictions enumerated above.

What might have been the historical background to the story of Ahab's death in battle? The new inscription from Tel Dan sheds unexpected light on the Israelite-Aramaic relations under the Omrides⁽³³⁾. The upper part of the inscription is unfortunately broken, but the extant first lines indicate that an unknown king of Israel fought the father of the author of the text, possibly at Abel (of Beth-Maacah), on the northern border of Israel⁽³⁴⁾. It remains unknown whether the unnamed king of Israel is Ahab or his son Joram. It seems that Israelite-Aramaic relations shifted from enmity to alliance and cooperation. This may open the way for the assumption that Ahab fought the Arameans either in Ramoth-Gilead or on the north Israelite border and was killed in that war.

Another possible interpretation is that the oral narrative referred to unnamed kings of Israel and Judah and that the two kings were identified with Ahab and Jehoshaphat when the story was first composed in writing. According to this assumption, the historical heroes of the oral story were Joram of Israel and Ahaziah of Judah, and the narrative originally described how Joram was killed in the battle of Ramoth-Gilead⁽³⁵⁾. Such a hypothesis may find support in the Aramaic inscription of Tel Dan, whose author, most probably Hazael, claims that he killed in battle the king of Israel, Joram, and Ahazyahu, king of Judah, contradicting the story in 2 Kgs 9, according to which the two kings were killed by Jehu near the town of Jezreel.

(33) A. BIRAN-J. NAVEH, "An Aramaic Stele Fragment from Tel Dan", *IEJ* 43 (1993) 81-98; id., "The Tel Dan Inscription: A New Fragment", *IEJ* 45 (1995) 1-18.

(34) For suggested reconstructions of lines 2-4, See BIRAN-NAVEH, "A New Fragment", 12-15; V. SASSON, "The Old Aramaic Inscription from Tel Dan: Philological, Literary and Historical Aspects", *JSS* 40 (1995) 14-17; N. NA'AMAN, "Hazael of 'Amqi and Hadadezer of Beth-rehob", *UF* 27 (1995) 389; W.M. SCHNIEDEWIND, "Tel Dan Stela: New Light on Aramaic and Jehu's Revolt", *BASOR* 302 (1996) 77-79.

(35) E. LIPÍŃSKI, "An Assyro-Israelite Alliance in 842/841 B.C.E.?", *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies I* (Jerusalem 1977) 273-278; id., "Aramäer und Israel", *TRE* 3 (1978) 596; id., "Aram et Israël du Xe au VIIIe siècle av. N.È.", *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 27 (1979) 76-77.

These suggested historical reconstructions are only theories and cannot be verified. They are raised in order to demonstrate that the narrative in 1 Kgs 22,1-18.29-37 should be taken into historical consideration and not perfunctorily dismissed as historically improbable.

*

* *

In conclusion, I would like to emphasize the following ten points:

1. Prophetic stories and "battle reports" were the main sources available to the Dtr for the history of the dynasty of Omri. These sources formed the basis for his value-judgments on the Omrides, and for other statements that he made about Ahab, Ahaziah and Joram (1 Kgs 22,39 may be an exception).
2. Only a few prophetic stories are included in the accounts of the Jehuities. The absence of such stories for this dynasty is reflected in the standard value-judgments of its kings, contrary to the detailed value-judgments on the Omrides.
3. Prophetic stories are the main sources for Jehoshaphat's value-judgment, for his relations with Israel and for the concluding statements of his reign (1 Kgs 22,43-47). Additional information about Jehoshaphat was drawn from the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah. 1 Kgs 22,48 is probably a logical inference drawn from the history of Jehoram, Jehoshaphat's son. Jehoram was defeated by the Edomites, who "set up a king of their own" (2 Kgs 8,20-22a). Hence the conclusion that formerly a Judean governor was nominated to administer Edom. Verse 49 was probably extracted from the Book of the Chronicles. Verse 50, on the other hand, is possibly an inference drawn from the absence of any reference to cooperation between Jehoshaphat and Ahaziah, king of Israel. Hence the 'logical' conclusion that Jehoshaphat, who went to war with Ahab and Joram, refused to cooperate with this king.
4. Contrary to the opinion of most scholars, 1 Kgs 22,1-18.29-37 should be treated as a possible historical source for the time of either Ahab or his son, Joram.
5. Narratives that are included in the Book of Kings should be studied in conjunction with the passages composed by the Dtr, since

on many occasions the former formed the source-material for the latter.

6. Contrary to the opinion of many scholars, the historical authenticity of a narrative is not a decisive criterion either for its date of composition or for the date of its integration into the Dtr history. A story may have had a long oral history in the course of which many details would have been replaced by others and the plot 'updated'. The process of writing always leads to many changes and filling in gaps in the plot. Regardless of their historical authenticity, pre-Dtr narratives were part of the stock stories available to the Dtr and used as sources for his historical composition.

7. It is dangerous to apply modern historical standards of writing to biblical history. Internal contradictions between different sources, unacceptable to modern historians, may have been tolerated by historians in ancient times. In addition to the few examples suggested in the discussion above we may recall the many contradictions between the Deuteronomistic and Chronic histories. The Chronicler felt free to write a new history in spite of the fact that the Dtr history was accessible to his readers and was considered to be of great antiquity in his time.

8. Tracing the sources available to the Dtr and the way in which he reworked and integrated them into his composition is essential for the analysis of the Dtr history. This is the most effective way of reconstructing the source-material and evaluating the contribution of the historian to his composition.

9. The Dtr exhausted his sources and left very little (if anything) that is not mentioned either explicitly or implicitly in his work. The number of sources available to him was quite limited, and he made great efforts to fill in the gaps and to write as detailed a historical picture as possible on the basis of these sources. The integration of narratives and other sources into his composition, the writing of his own text on the basis of their words and the references to his sources in the concluding statements of each reign are all part of his strategy of filling in the gaps and writing the most detailed history of his people.

10. The Book of the Chronicles of the kings of Israel/Judah is the name of a major source available to the historian. When it is mentioned in the concluding statements on kings it is used as a name for all the sources available to the historian for reconstructing their reigns⁽³⁶⁾.

Department of Jewish History
Tel Aviv University
Ramat Aviv 69978
Israel

Nadav NA'AMAN

SUMMARY

Tracing the sources available to the Dtr historian and the way he integrated them into his composition is the point of departure for this study. The detailed analysis of the value-judgments, and the concluding statements on Jehoshaphat, Ahab, Ahaziah and Joram, indicate that they were written on the basis of the prophetic stories and "battle reports" of 1 Kgs 17–19; 21–22; 2 Kgs 1; 3 and 9–10. These narratives were the main sources available to the Dtr for describing the histories of Jehoshaphat and the Omrides. The pre-Dtr story in 1 Kgs 22 included vv. 1–18, 29–37, whereas vv. 19–28 were written by the Dtr when he integrated the story of Ahab's death in battle into his historical composition. The lack of agreement between prophetic narratives and passages composed by the Dtr suggests that such contradictions were tolerated by the historian and his readers and that we must be careful not to attribute modern historical standards to biblical historians. A detailed analysis of the Dtr history shows that the historian exhausted all his sources and left very little that is not mentioned either explicitly or implicitly in his work.

⁽³⁶⁾ This was already observed by G. GARBINI, "Le fonti citate nel 'Libro dei Re'", *Henoch* 3 (1981) 26–44.

Die "Wagen meines edlen Volkes" (Hld 6,12): eine strukturelle Analyse

Hld 6,12 gilt bekanntlich noch heute als "der schwierigste Vers des Hld" ⁽¹⁾. Noch vor kurzem schrieb Ravasi in seinem monumentalen Kommentar: "Perciò, pur traducendo in qualche modo il passo, affermiamo che il testo così come giace è un 'rebus' irrisolto e forse per sempre insolubile" ⁽²⁾. Andererseits fasziniert dieser Text immer neu die Exegeten, wie auch drei in letzterer Zeit erschienene Aufsätze bestätigen ⁽³⁾. Ich möchte mich diesen Autoren anschließen. Ich glaube nämlich, gegen Ravasi, daß der Text doch einen Sinn hat, und daß dieser Sinn nicht durch textuelle Eingriffe, sondern durch eine sorgfältige strukturelle Analyse des Kontextes gewonnen werden kann, was m.E. bisher zu wenig gemacht worden ist ⁽⁴⁾.

I. Die Makrostruktur: 5,2-8,4

Zu welcher poetischen Einheit gehört 6,12? Um diese Frage zu beantworten, muß man eine Gesamtstruktur des Hld entwer-

⁽¹⁾ Das wird in den neuesten Kommentaren anerkannt. Vgl. u.a., A. ROBERT-R. TOURNAY, *Le Cantique des Cantiques* (EB; Paris 1963) 244; M.H. POPE, *Song of Songs* (AB; New York 1977) 584; G. KRINETZKI, *Kommentar zum Hohenlied. Bildsprache und theologische Botschaft* (BET 16; Frankfurt 1981) 188 (Krinetzki verzichtet, den Vers zu übersetzen); F. LANDY, *Paradoxes of Paradise. Identity and Difference in the Song of Songs* (BiLiSe 7; Sheffield 1983) 333-334; O. KEEL, *Das Hohelied* (ZB; Zürich 1986) 208; R.E. MURPHY, *The Song of Songs* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis 1990) 176; H.-P. MÜLLER-O. KAISER-J.A. LOADER, *Das Hohelied, Klagelieder, Das Buch Ester* (ATD 16/2; Göttingen 1992) 70.

⁽²⁾ G. RAVASI, *Il Cantico dei Cantici* (Bologna 1992) 524.

⁽³⁾ R. TOURNAY, "Les chariots d'Aminadab", *Quand Dieu parle aux hommes le langage de l'amour. Études sur le Cantique des Cantiques* (Cahiers de la Revue Biblique 21; Paris 1982) 73-81; M.J. MULDER, "Does Cantic 6,12 Make Sense?", *The Scriptures and the Scrolls* (FS. A.S. Van der Woude [Hrsg. F. GARCIA MARTINEZ u.a.]) (VTS 49; Leiden 1992) 104-113; A. LACOCQUE, "La Shulamite et les chars d'Aminadab: Un essai herméneutique sur Cantique 6,12-7,1", *RB* 102 (1995) 330-347.

⁽⁴⁾ Unter den wenigen, die den Text in seinem Kontext betrachten, möchte ich V. HAMP, "Zur Textkritik am Hohenlied", *BZ* 1 (1957) 197-214, bes. 207-208 erwähnen.

fen⁽⁵⁾. Ich möchte hier nur die Ergebnisse meiner Untersuchungen skizzieren, da es unmöglich ist, in einem kurzen Artikel sie ausführlich darzustellen. M.E. ist der zentrale Teil des Hld durch zwei Blöcke charakterisiert: 2,8–5,1 und 5,2–8,4. Für die Gliederung dieser Blöcke sind vor allem zwei strukturelle Prinzipien von Bedeutung: zum einen das sprechende Subjekt, zum anderen der Spannungsbogen von einer Situation der Trennung zu einer Situation der Vereinigung. Ich beschränke mich auf 5,2–8,4.

Was das sprechende Subjekt betrifft, fängt mit 5,2 eine Serie von Liedern der Frau an, die bis zu 6,3 geht. In 6,4 fängt der Mann an zu sprechen. Die Rede des Mannes geht bis 7,10aa und wird von einer kurzen Antwort der Frau (7,10ab–11) abgeschlossen. Mit 7,12 beginnt eine zweite Rede der Frau, die in 8,4 endet (in 8,5 ergreift nämlich der Chor das Wort).

Was die Spannung Trennung/Vereinigung betrifft, markiert der "Kehrvers der Zugehörigkeit"⁽⁶⁾ in 6,3 schon eine bestimmte Vereinigung der Liebenden, die die Spannung von 5,2–8 löst. Es handelt sich aber nicht um eine reale Vereinigung, sondern um einen Wunsch der Frau, die sich nach Vereinigung sehnt. Dieser Sehnsucht der Frau entspricht in 6,4–7,10 die Sehnsucht des Mannes. Die Lieder des Mannes enden, wie die der Frau, mit dem "Kehrvers der Zugehörigkeit" in 7,11. Hier klingt der Kehrvers etwas anders als in 6,3 (vgl. 2,16): "Ich gehöre meinem Geliebten, und sein Verlangen *tešûqātô* ist nach mir". Damit faßt die Frau den Inhalt der Lieder

(⁵) Vgl. dazu R. RENDTORFF, *Das Alte Testament*. Eine Einführung (Neukirchen 1992) 275–277; J.C. EXUM, "A Literary and Structural Analysis of the Song of Songs", *ZAW* 85 (1973) 47–79; W.H. SHEA, "The Chiastic Structure of the Song of Songs", *ZAW* 92 (1980) 378–396; E.C. WEBSTER, "Pattern in the Song of Songs", *JSOT* 22 (1982) 73–93; H.-J. HEINEVETTER, *Komm nun, mein Liebster, Dein Garten ruft Dich*. Das Hohelied als programmatische Komposition (BBB 69; Frankfurt 1988); M.T. ELLIOTT, *The Literary Unity of the Canticle* (EHS; Frankfurt 1989); D.A. DORSEY, "Literary Structuring in the Song of Songs", *JSOT* 46 (1990) 81–96; L. SCHWIENHORST-SCHONBERGER, "Das Hohelied", *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Hrsg. E. ZENGER u.a.) (Stuttgart 1995) 270–274; E. BOSSHARD-NEPUSTIL, "Zu Struktur und Sachprofil des Hohenliedes", *BN* 81 (1996) 45–71. Mein Strukturvorschlag kommt denen von Rendtorff, Heinevetter und Elliott am nächsten.

(⁶) Vgl. dazu J. ANGÉNIEUX, "Structure du Cantique des Cantiques en chants encadrés par des refrains alternants", *ETL* 41 (1965) 96–142 ("refrain de la possession", S. 104.110).

des Mannes (6,4–7,10aa) zusammen. Die Vereinigung findet erst am Ende der dritten Einheit (7,12–8,4) statt: sie wird von dem “Kehrvers der Umarmung” ausgedrückt (8,3 vgl. 2,6)⁽⁷⁾, dem die Beschwörung an die Töchter Jerusalems folgt, die Liebe nicht zu stören (8,4 vgl. 2,7; 3,5)⁽⁸⁾. Als Makrostruktur für 5,2–8,4 erweist sich also eine dreiteilige Gliederung⁽⁹⁾:

A.	5,2–6,3	Lieder der Frau	6,3	<i>Kehrvers der Zugehörigkeit</i>
B.	6,4–7,11	Lieder des Mannes	7,11	<i>Kehrvers der Zugehörigkeit</i>
A’.	7,12–8,4	Lieder der Frau	8,3	<i>Kehrvers der Umarmung</i>

II. Die “Lieder des Mannes”: 6,4–7,11⁽¹⁰⁾

Nachdem die Vereinigung der Liebenden (5,1) gestört wurde (5,2–6), machte sich zuerst die Frau auf die Suche nach ihrem Geliebten (5,7–6,3). Am Ende der Einheit sagte sie, daß der Geliebte auf dem Weg zu ihr war (6,2–3). Die zweite Einheit (6,4–7,11) stellt die Suche des Mannes ausführlich dar. Dabei ist die Verbindung mit den “Liedern der Frau” (5,2–6,3) zu beachten. Das letzte Lied der Frau 6,2–3 leitet nicht nur thematisch die Suche des Mannes ein, sondern wird auch am Ende der beiden Lieder des Mannes wieder aufgenommen: 6,11 nimmt das Motiv des “Hinabsteigens in den Garten” (6,2) wieder auf, und 7,11 den Kehrvers der Zugehörigkeit (6,3). Drückte 5,2–6,3 das Verlangen der Frau nach ihrem Mann aus, so 6,4–7,11 das Verlangen des Mannes nach seiner Frau. Am Ende der beiden Lieder des Mannes wird das Motiv “Verlangen” deutlich ausgedrückt (6,12 *napšî* “meine Sehnsucht”, 7,11 *ʾešûqātô* “sein Verlangen”). Wächst das Verlangen der Frau aus der Bewunderung des Geliebten (vgl. das Beschreibungslied 5,10–16)⁽¹¹⁾, so be-

(7) “Refrain de l’embrassement” nach ANGÉNIEUX, ebd.

(8) “Refrain du réveil” nach ANGÉNIEUX, *Structure*, 105.107–108.

(9) Diese Gliederung entspricht einer ähnlichen Strukturierung des Blockes 2,8–5,1. Auch hier zeigt sich eine dreiteilige Untergliederung: (A) 2,8–3,5: Lieder der Frau; (B) 3,6–11: Intermezzo (Chor?); (C) 4,1–5,1: Lieder des Mannes (für diese Struktur vgl. HEINEVETTER, *Garten*, 132–136; RENDTORFF, *Einführung*, 275–276).

(10) Für diese Abgrenzung vgl. RAVASI, *Cantico*, 490–495; D. LYS, *Le plus beau chant de la création. Commentaire du Cantique des Cantiques* (LD 51; Paris 1961) 234–270. Anders als ich setzen R. und L. das Ende der Einheit in 7,10 an.

(11) Entscheidend ist dabei, daß der Liebende im Partner sich selbst erkennt: die Frau erkennt die eigenen Merkmale am Körper ihres Geliebten

stehen auch die Lieder des Mannes im wesentlichen aus bewundernden Beschreibungen der Frau (6,4-10; 7,2-6). Die erste Einheit (5,2-6,3) ist durch einen Dialog zwischen der Frau und den Töchtern Jerusalems charakterisiert, die zweite durch einen Dialog zwischen dem Mann und einem Chor. Die Stimme der Frau klingt erst am Ende der Einheit an (7,10b-11) und bildet eine chiasmatische Entsprechung zu der Stimme des Mannes am Anfang der ersten Einheit (5,2). Die folgende Tabelle zeigt die redenden Subjekte:

6,4-9	<i>Mann</i>
6,10	<i>Chor</i>
6,11-12	<i>Mann</i>
7,1a	<i>Chor</i>
7,1b	<i>Mann</i>
7,2-10aa	<i>Mann</i>
7,10aß-11	<i>Frau</i>

Wie oft im Hld, spielen auch in unserer Einheit besondere Stichwörter eine strukturierende Rolle. Es ist der Fall vor allem bei *jph* "schön". Das Wort erscheint in 6,4 (Anfang des ersten Beschreibungsliedes), 6,10 (Bewunderung durch den Chor), 7,2 (Anfang des zweiten Beschreibungsliedes) und 7,7 (Schlußteil, 7,7-10aa). Eine ähnliche Rolle kommt den Interrogationspartikeln *mî* (6,10) und *māh* (7,1.2.7) zu. Wie *jph* signalisieren auch sie den Anfang einer neuen poetischen Einheit.

Innerhalb der Einheit 6,4-7,11 bilden die zwei Lieder 6,4-12 und 7,1-11 eine Art Diptychon⁽¹²⁾. Den beiden Beschreibungsliedern 6,4-9(A) und 7,2-6(A') folgt jeweils eine bewundernde Zusammenfassung, die auf den Anfang des *wasf* zurückgreift (B. 6,10; B'. 7,7-8), und eine Bewegung zur Vereinigung, die durch die erste Person charakterisiert ist (C. 6,11-12 *jāradtî*, *lo' jādā'tî*; C'. 7,9-10: *'āmartî*; *'æ^clæh*)⁽¹³⁾. Präzise Stichwortentsprechungen markieren

und umgekehrt (vgl. dazu: ELLIOTT, *Unity*, 138-139). Diese Auffassung der Sexualität, die im Zugehörigkeitsrefrain 6,2; 7,11 Ausdruck findet, entspricht dem Schrei des ersten Mannes in Gen 2,23: "Das ist endlich Fleisch von meinem Fleisch und Bein von meinem Bein!"

⁽¹²⁾ Das wird von Ravasi richtig bemerkt (*Cantico*, 490-495).

⁽¹³⁾ Man merke die Entsprechung: *jāradtî* 6,11 und *'æ^cjlæh* 7,9; *lo' jādā'tî* 6,12 und *'āmartî* 7,9. Formell bilden die Wörter einen Chiasmus, inhaltlich entgegengesetzte Begriffspaare.

die Knotenpunkte und verbinden die verschiedenen Einheiten. Die Antwort der Frau (7,10aß-11) stellt eine Art Coda dar. Sie ist umrahmt durch das Wort *dôdî* (10aß.11a), das gleichzeitig ein Pendant zu *ra^cjâtî* (6,4) bildet. Außerdem bilden die Wörter *ʾanî* und *dôdî* in 7,11 eine Inklusion mit 5,2: die beiden Einheiten 5,2-6,3 und 6,4-7,11 werden dadurch eingerahmt.

I	A. 6,4-9	MANN	Beschreibung (stehend)	<i>jph, ra^cjâtî</i> (4)
	B. 6,10	CHOR	Bewunderung	<i>mî, jph</i> (10)
	C. 6,11-12	MANN	Bewegung	<i>jâradtî</i> (11) "sehen" (<i>r^h</i> , 11 2x) <i>lo³ jâda^ctî</i> (12)
II	B'. 7,1a	CHOR	Aufforderung zum Tanz	"sehen" (<i>hzh</i>)
	C'. 7,1b	MANN	Frage	<i>mâh</i> , "sehen" (<i>hzh</i>)
	A'. 7,2-6	MANN	Beschreibung (tanzend)	<i>mâh, jph</i> (2)
	7,7-8		Bewunderung	<i>mâh, jph</i> (7)
	7,9-10aa		Bewegung	<i>ʾâmartî</i> (9) <i>ʾæ^clæh</i> (9) <i>dôdî</i> (10.11)
III	D. 7,10aß-11	FRAU	Einwilligung	

Der Aufbau ist dadurch kompliziert, daß die Abfolge "Beschreibung - Bewunderung - Bewegung" im ersten Teil (6,4-12) dialogisch gestaltet ist (MANN – CHOR – MANN), im zweiten dagegen 7,2-10aa) von einem "Solo" des Mannes gesungen wird. Der Dialog findet im zweiten Teil vor dem Beschreibungslied statt, so daß von den sprechenden Subjekten aus eine fast chiasmische Struktur entsteht (ABCB'C'A'), die quer zu der parallelen Wiederaufnahme der Abfolge "Beschreibung – Bewunderung – Bewegung" (6,4-12; 7,2-10aa) steht.

Das Ende des ersten Liedes (6,10-12) und der Anfang des zweiten sind sorgfältig miteinander verbunden, nicht nur durch die dialogische Gestaltung (2x CHOR – MANN), sondern auch durch das Verb "sehen" (*r^h* 6,11 [2x], *hzh* 7,1 [2x]) und durch die militärische Metaphorik (*mark^ebôt* 6,12, *maḥ^anājīm* 7,1)⁽¹⁴⁾. Inhaltlich leitet die "Bewegung", die in 6,11-12 zum Ausdruck kommt (*jrd* 6,11, *mark^ebôt* 6,12), zum "Tanz" (*šwb*, *m^eḥolāh* 7,1) über.

(¹⁴) Die Verbindung von 6,12 mit 7,1 durch die militärische Metaphorik wird von Keel richtig bemerkt (KEEL, *Das Hohelied*, 208-209), der aber die andere Verbindung, mit 6,10 *nidgālôt*, nicht berücksichtigt.

III. Das Lied 6,4-12

Die Gliederung unseres Liedes ist sehr umstritten, selbst bei den Autoren, die eine Gesamtstruktur des Hld voraussetzen. Unsere Hypothese wächst aus der Erkenntnis der Parallelität zwischen 6,4-12 und 7,1-10aa. Die oben ausgeführten Beobachtungen lassen eine dreiteilige Gliederung erkennen: A. 4-9 (MANN; Beschreibung); B. 10 (CHOR; Bewunderung); A'. 11-12 (MANN; Bewegung). Diese Gliederung stimmt mit dem MT überein, der eine Setuma nach V. 9 und 10 setzt.

a. *Beschreibung: V. 4-9*

Die kompositorische Einheit von 6,4-9 wird von H.-J. Heinevetter erkannt, der aber m.E. zu weit geht, indem er die Verse 10-12 der Einheit 6,10-8,6 zuordnet⁽¹⁵⁾. V. 10 ist mit dem Vorausgehenden unverkennbar verbunden. Man beachte zum einen die Kontinuität zwischen der Erwähnung der "anderen Frauen" in V. 8-9 und dem Lob in V. 10, welches dann als ein Zitat der Frauen erscheint; zum anderen die Wiederaufnahme von "schön" und "furchterregend wie die geordneten Heere" aus V. 4. Man könnte annehmen, die Wiederaufnahme von V. 4 in 10 signalisiere Anfang und Ende der Einheit 6,4-10⁽¹⁶⁾. Aber die Parallele mit 7,7 läßt eher an eine "Reprise" als an eine "Inklusion" denken. V. 10 gehört zum Lied, das mit 6,4 beginnt, aber er markiert einen neuen Anfang, der durch den Subjektwechsel gekennzeichnet wird. Auch in 3,6 und 8,5 beginnt mit der Frage *mî zo't* eine neue poetische Einheit. Andererseits besitzt die "chorische" Erweiterung des Preises in V. 8-9 eine abschließende Funktion, wie die Parallelen 1,3b.4b; 3,10-11 zeigen⁽¹⁷⁾.

⁽¹⁵⁾ HEINEVETTER, *Garten*, 145. So auch H. RINGGREN-A. WEISER, *Das Hohe Lied – Klagelieder – Das Buch Esther* (ATD 16/2; Göttingen 1958) 30.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Meistens wird V. 10 mit dem Vorausgehenden verbunden; vgl. u.a. ELLIOTT, *Unity*, 149; RAVASI, *Cantico*, 491; KEEL, *Das Hohelied*, 202; MÜLLER, *Das Hohelied*, 65-66; MURPHY, *Song*, 174; G. GERLEMAN, *Ruth – Das Hohelied* (BKAT 18; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1965) 184; W. RUDOLPH, *Das Buch Ruth – Das Hohelied – Die Klagelieder* (KAT 17; Gütersloh 1962) 164; RENDTORFF, *Einführung*, 276.

⁽¹⁷⁾ So mit Recht HEINEVETTER, *Garten*, 145.

Das Lied ist in drei Strophen gegliedert: 4.5-7.8-9. Die erste Strophe (4) wirft auf die Frau einen Gesamtblick. Sie besteht aus einer Reihe von drei gleich aufgebauten Vergleichen, von denen zwei das "Schöne" der Frau hervorheben ("schön wie Tirza", "anmutig wie Jerusalem" 4a) und der dritte das "Furchterregende" ("furchterregend wie die geordneten Heere" 4b)⁽¹⁸⁾.

Die Erwähnung der Augen (5a) verbindet sich mit dem Thema "furchterregend", aber die Satzkonstruktion ist anders. Der Halbvers will also zur zweiten Strophe gerechnet werden. Ihm folgt eine Reihe von drei weiteren Gesichtsteilen (Haar, Zähne und Wange) die wortwörtlich, bis auf kleine Korrekturen, aus 4,1-3b übernommen sind. Ist die erste Strophe durch eine städtische (Tirza, Jerusalem) und militärische (Heere) Metaphorik gekennzeichnet, so kommen die Metaphern der zweiten Strophe aus dem Naturleben (Ziege, Schafe, Granatapfel).

Die dritte Strophe (V. 8-9) kommt zur Stadtmetaphorik zurück und gibt, wie die erste, einen Gesamteindruck von der Frau wieder. Die Geliebte wird jetzt nicht mehr für sich selbst betrachtet, sondern auf dem Hintergrund eines königlichen Harems. Der chorische Hintergrund unterstreicht zum einen die Einzigartigkeit der Frau, und zum anderen verleiht er dem Lobpreis des Jünglings einen kollektiven, objektiveren Charakter⁽¹⁹⁾.

Der Dichter spielt mit den Zahlen. Ist die erste Strophe durch die Zahl 3 gekennzeichnet, so die zweite durch die Zahl 4. Die Zahl der Vollendung ist 7, 3+4. In V. 8 werden die Zahlen 60 (= 3 x 20) und 80 (= 4 x 20) erwähnt, so daß die vier Zahlen eine parallele Entsprechung zeigen: A. 3; B. 4; A'. 3x20 (60); B'. 4x 20 (80). Diese Beobachtung bestätigt den abschließenden Charakter der dritten Strophe.

b. *Bewunderung: V. 10*

Wie V. 4 so ist auch 10 durch das Binom "schön" "furchterregend" charakterisiert. Ist das "Schöne" in V. 4 durch die Stadtmeta-

⁽¹⁸⁾ Ich verstehe *nidgālôt* V. 4.10 als Part. Nif. des Denominativverbs *dgl* (mit *HALAT*). Dadurch ergibt sich eine Verbindung mit *diglô* 2,4 und *dāgûl* 5,10. M.E. ist es kaum vorstellbar, daß das Wort an den anderen Stellen eine andere Bedeutung hat (gegen *HALAT*); vgl. KEEL, *Das Hohelied*, 202.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Vgl. dazu G. BARBIERO, "Die Liebe der Töchter Jerusalems. Hld 3,10b im Kontext von 3,6-11", *BZ* 39 (1995) 96-104, bes. 103-104.

phorik versinnbildlicht, so in V. 10 durch die Himmelsmetaphorik, d.h. durch die Natur. Das "Furchterregende" wird dann, in V. 10 wie in V. 4, durch die militärische Metapher der "geordneten Heere" vertreten.

Derselbe Rhythmus ist in V. 11-12 zu spüren. In V. 11, in Parallelismus zu 10abaß, wird das "Schöne" der Liebe dargestellt. Die Gartenmetaphorik blickt nämlich auf V. 6-7 zurück (Stichwortverbindung "Granatapfel", V. 11 und 7). Wieder sind wir bei der Natur wie in V. 10abaß. War dort vom Himmel die Rede, so jetzt, kontrastiv dazu ("ich bin hinabgestiegen"), von der Erde. Das "Himmlische" verkörpert sich in einer irdischen, ganz konkreten Kreatur. V. 12 kehrt wieder zu dem Aspekt des "Schrecklichen" und zu der militärischen Metaphorik ("Wagen") zurück.

Das Binom "schön"/"furchterregend"⁽²⁰⁾ erweist sich als maßgebendes Strukturmittel des Liedes 6,4-12⁽²¹⁾. Zu diesem Binom gesellt sich das andere: "Stadt"/"Natur", dem eine sekundäre aber nicht unwichtige Rolle zukommt⁽²²⁾. Letzteres bildet eine eigene Struktur, die teilweise quer zur ersten steht.

A. SCHÖN	4a	A. STADT
B. FURCHTERREGEND	4b	
B'. FURCHTERREGEND	5	B. NATUR
A'. SCHÖN	6-7	
—	8-9	A'. STADT
A. SCHÖN	10abaß	B. NATUR
B. FURCHTERREGEND	10by	A. STADT
A'. SCHÖN	11	B'. NATUR
B'. FURCHTERREGEND	12	A'. STADT

⁽²⁰⁾ Nach einem ähnlichen Prinzip wird das Haupt des Geliebten in 5,11-12 bewundert. Die zwei Kopfteile Haare und Augen werden deswegen gewählt, weil sie die beiden polaren Aspekte der Liebe darstellen. Die schwarzen Haare verkörpern das "Dämonische" der Liebe ("Dionysos"), die weißen Augen das "Schöne" ("Apollo").

⁽²¹⁾ Betrachtet man die Struktur von 6,4-12 unter diesem Aspekt, dann steht die Aussage über die Einzigkeit der Geliebten (6,8-9) im Zentrum der Struktur. Dieser Aspekt wird von Lys mit Recht hervorgehoben, wenn er die Einheit 6,4-7,10 mit dem Titel: "L'unique" überschreibt (LYS, *Chant*, 234).

⁽²²⁾ Diese zweite Polarität wird am Schluß des Blocks 5,2-8,4 wieder aufgenommen. Die "Lieder der Frau" 7,12-8,4 stellen die Liebe in der Natur (7,12-14) der Liebe in der Stadt (8,1-4) gegenüber. Es handelt sich dabei um ein Leitmotiv des Hohenliedes, wie die Arbeit von Heinevetter mit Recht unterstreicht (HEINEVETTER, *Garten*, 179-190, vor allem 187-188).

V. 10 ist also strukturell mit 11-12 verbunden. Diese Verbindung, die meistens nicht anerkannt wird, ist m.E. wesentlich, um den Sinn von V. 12 zu verstehen. Aber, wie bemerkt, ist V. 10 gleichzeitig mit den vorausgehenden Versen verbunden, das Lob wird nämlich von den Haremsfrauen (V. 8-9) gesprochen. Das Wort *bārāh* "rein" bzw. "auserkoren" ist V. 10 und 9 gemeinsam. Oben wurde der Rhythmus der Zahlen hingewiesen: 3 in der ersten Strophe, 4 in der Zweiten und 3 ... 4 (bzw. 60 ... 80) in der dritten. In der dritten Strophe wird aber gleichzeitig die Zahl 3 unterstrichen (den 3 Kategorien von Haremsfrauen in V. 8 und 9b entspricht die dreimalige Betonung der Einzigkeit der Freundin in V. 9a). Auffallenderweise kommt V. 10 wieder auf die Zahl 4 (Morgenrot, Mond, Sonne und "geordnete Heere") zurück, wie die zweite Strophe, so daß die Verse 4-10 zweimal die Alternierung 3/4 zeigen. Zweimal wird die Zahl der Vollendung, 7, erreicht:

V. 4	3 Attribute/Vergleiche
V. 5-6	4 Körperteile
V. 8-9	3x3 (Haremsfrauen - die Eine - Haremsfrauen)
V. 10	4 Attribute/Vergleiche

c. *Bewegung: V. 11-12*

Die Verse 11-12 werden gewöhnlich von 10 getrennt, als gäbe es keine Verbindung zwischen den beiden Einheiten. Man muß zugeben, daß die Verbindungen nicht so offensichtlich sind. Die Wortentsprechungen fehlen. Auf die semantische Parallelität zwischen den beiden Aspekten der Liebe: "schön" (= 10abaß.11) und "furchterregend" (= 10by.12) wurde schon hingewiesen. Inhaltlich kann man die Kontinuität der beiden Einheiten so formulieren: in V. 10by war von der unwiderstehlichen Kraft der Geliebten die Rede ("furchterregend wie die geordneten Heere"). In V. 11-12 wird die "Kapitulation" des Mannes dargestellt, der von der Liebe "besiegt", "erobert" wird. Die "Kapitulation" wird durch die Metapher der "Bewegung" ausgedrückt. Diese Metapher verbindet die beiden Verse 11 und 12: die "Wagen" (V. 12) wollen im Zusammenhang mit dem "Hinabsteigen" (V. 11) verstanden werden. Es handelt sich in beiden Fällen um das "Von-der-Liebe-ergriffen-werden". Es ist die Bewegung, die zu der Vereinigung führt. Dieser Hinweis auf die Vereinigung schließt das erste Lied des Mannes ab und leitet gleichzeitig das zweite Lied ein, das durch die rauschende Bewegung des Tanzes charakterisiert ist.

Ich habe vorausgesetzt, daß das sprechende Subjekt der Mann ist. Das ist aber nicht unumstritten. Für manche Autoren spricht in V. 11-12⁽²³⁾, oder mindestens in V. 12⁽²⁴⁾, die Frau. Dagegen steht, m.E., daß der Garten im Hld immer Metapher für die Frau ist (vgl. 4,12-5,1; 6,2)⁽²⁵⁾. Der Rückverweis auf 6,2 (und 5,1) ist deutlich. Der Geliebte bestätigt in 6,11, was die Frau in 6,2 von ihm sagte ("mein Geliebter ist zu seinem Garten hinabgestiegen").

Die Tempora sind hier perfektisch. Bezieht sich der Mann auf die Vergangenheit, will er also auf 6,2 Bezug nehmen ("Zum Nußgarten *war* ich hinabgestiegen"), oder will er die Gegenwart schildern? Da auch in 5,1 das "Kommen-in-den-Garten" perfektisch beschrieben und doch auf die Gegenwart bezogen wird, ist ein Bezug auf die Gegenwart auch in unserem Fall wahrscheinlich. Durch die Bewunderung seiner Frau (V. 4-10) wuchs also beim Geliebten jenes Verlangen (*nepeš*, V. 12), das jetzt zur "Bewegung" drängt.

IV. "Die Wagen meines edlen Volkes": V. 12

Wenn meine strukturelle Analyse stimmt, dann ist V. 12 der letzte Vers des Liedes 6,4-12. In ihm spricht der Mann. Wie gewöhnlich im Hld ist im letzten Vers ein Bezug auf das Vorausgehende zu erwarten, sogar mit einem "Überraschungseffekt"⁽²⁶⁾.

Der erste Halbvers enthält 4 Wörter: *lo' jāda'tî napšî šāmatnî*. Das Problem dabei ist, zu wissen, ob *napšî* Objekt zu *jāda'tî* ("Ich kenne meine Seele nicht mehr")⁽²⁷⁾ oder Subjekt zu *šāmatnî* ("Ich

(23) So u.a. ROBERT-TOURNAY, *Cantique*, 244; MURPHY, *Song*, 178-179; POPE, *Song*, 579-591; HEINEVETTER, *Garten*, 151; G. GARBINI, *Il Cantico dei Cantici* (Brescia 1992) 247-248. Das wird auch von G vorausgesetzt, das in V. 11 den Zusatz (aus 7,13) hinzufügt: ἐκεῖ δώσω τοὺς μαστοῦς μου σοι. Der Parallelismus mit 7,13 bedeutet aber keineswegs, daß in beiden Fällen dieselbe Person spricht. Vielmehr ist 7,13 die bereitwillige Antwort auf 6,11 (es handelt um einen typischen Fall von "Mirroring Dynamic", vgl. zum Begriff ELLIOTT, *Unity*, 246-249).

(24) So z.B. LYS, *Chant*, 265; ELLIOTT, *Unity*, 161.

(25) So wohl die meisten Kommentare. Vgl. HAMP, *Textkritik*, 207-208.

(26) Vgl. z.B. 1,5,8; 2,17; 3,10; 4,6...

(27) M. BUBER, *Die Schriftwerke* (Darmstadt 1986) 354. Ähnlich u.a. GERLEMAN, *Das Hohelied* 190; G. NOLLI, *Cantico dei Cantici* (SB[T]; Torino 1968) 127; R. GORDIS, *The Song of Songs and Lamentations. A Study, Modern Translation and Commentary* (New York 1974) 95; LYS, *Chant*, 245; S.M. PAUL, "An Unrecognized Medical Idiom in Canticle 6,12", *Bib* 59 (1978) 545-547; LACOCQUE, *Shulamite*, 338; TOB.

wußte nicht, aber mein Verlangen versetzte mich") ist. Die Akzente des MT empfehlen die zweite Übersetzung, die auch von G (οὐκ ἔγνων ἢ ψυχὴ μου ἔθετό με) und Vg (*nescivi, anima mea conturbavit me*) befolgt wird.

lo' jāda'tî. Wie Murphy bemerkt, drückt der Anfang des Verses eine Überraschung aus⁽²⁸⁾. Der Sinn des Satzes ist also wohl: "Ohne, daß ich es merkte, ...".

napšî šāmatnî. Wie in 1,7 und 3,1-4 drückt *nepes* auch hier das "Verlangen" aus⁽²⁹⁾. Das Wort steht nämlich parallel zu *tēšûqāh* 7,11. In beiden Fällen wird dadurch auf das vorausgehende Bewunderungsglied zurückgeblickt. Durch die Betrachtung des Körpers der Frau (6,4-9 vgl. 7,2-8) wuchs also im Geliebten ein unwiderstehliches Verlangen nach Vereinigung.

šāmatnî markēbôt kann zweifach übersetzt werden. Da auf hebräisch keine Präposition vor "Wagen" steht, kann man natürlich den Ausdruck als einen Fall von doppeltem Akkusativ verstehen: "Mein Verlangen machte aus mir die Wagen ..." ⁽³⁰⁾. Man könnte aber auch eine Präposition vor "Wagen" als miteinbegriffen voraussetzen und zu der Übersetzung gelangen: "Mein Verlangen versetzte mich zu den Wagen ..." ⁽³¹⁾. Vielleicht ist der Unterschied zwischen beiden Übersetzungen nicht so groß: die zweite kann nämlich als Metapher für die erste interpretiert werden. Wichtig ist m.E.

⁽²⁸⁾ MURPHY, *Song*, 176 ("Before I knew it" = "unawares" or "suddenly"), vgl. ELLIOTT, *Unity*, 161; MÜLLER, *Das Hohelied*, 71 ("Der ganze Satz scheint eine Überraschung ausdrücken zu wollen — aber welche?").

⁽²⁹⁾ Vgl. C. WESTERMANN, "*nepes* Seele", *THAT* II, 75-77; H. SEEBASS, "*nepes*", *TWAT* V, 540-545.

⁽³⁰⁾ So G ἔθετό με ἄρματα Ἀμινὰδὰβ. Unter den Modernen vgl. RAVASI, *Cantico*, 524-525 ("Mi ha reso come i cocchi della classe principesca"); TOURNAY, *Langage*, 75 ("Il a fait de moi les chariots d'Amminadab"); MURPHY, *Song*, 176 ("My hearth made me 'the blessed one' of the prince's people"). Zur Diskussion vgl. D. BARTHÉLEMY u.a., *Preliminary and Interim Report on the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project* (HOTTP) (New York 1979) III, 610-611.

⁽³¹⁾ Eine Präposition vor "Wagen" wird von Symmachos (ἀπὸ ἀρμάτων) und Quinta (εἰς ἄρματα) vorausgesetzt (vgl. F. FIELD, *Origenis hexapla* (Hildesheim 1964) II, 421). Für die Diskussion vgl. HAMP, *Textkritik*, 208; ROBERT-TOURNAY, *Cantique*, 244-245; MURPHY, *Song*, 176; MULDER, *Canticle*, 111. Die meisten modernen Kommentare setzen eine Präposition (*bē* oder *al*) voraus (EÜ, Keel, Müller: "zu den Wagen"; Buber: "ins Gefährt"; Ringgren: "auf den Wagen" ...).

wahrzunehmen, daß hier eine "Verwandlung" dargestellt wird, und zwar eine, die vom "Verlangen" verursacht wird⁽³²⁾.

Das Binom "schön" "furchterregend" durchzieht, wie bemerkt, das ganze Lied. "Furchterregend 'a^jummāh wie die geordneten Heere" ist die Freundin (6,4b.10by), ihre Augen bringen Verwirrung (6,5). Es handelt sich nicht um eine defensive, sondern um eine offensive Streitkraft⁽³³⁾: damit wird die Macht der Liebe angedeutet, der der junge Mann nicht zu widerstehen vermag⁽³⁴⁾. Zu diesem Kontext paßt das Wort "Wagen" *markēbôt*. Der Plural bezieht sich im AT gewöhnlich auf die "Streitwagen" (vgl. Ex 14,25; 15,4; Ri 5,28; Joël 2,5; Hab 3,8; Jes 11,6.9; 32,18; 66,15; Jer 4,13; Mi 5,9). Übrigens bestimmt die militärische Metaphorik auch 7,1 (*maḥanājim* "Kriegslager"). Dadurch scheitern jene Interpretationen, die in *markēbôt* "den Wagen" (Sing.) sehen, auf der die Bundeslade transportiert wurde (1 Sam 6; 2 Sam 6)⁽³⁵⁾, oder den Cherubenthron (Ez 1,10 vgl. Sir 49,9)⁽³⁶⁾. Der Plural *markēbôt* "Kriegswagen" stimmt mit dem Plural *nigdālôt* "geordnete Heere" (V. 4.10) überein. Das Streitkorps gilt als *pars pro toto*, um das ganze Heer zu bezeichnen.

Hier liegt m.E. die Pointe des Liedes, die Verblüffung, die typisch für das Hld ist (vgl. 6,2⁽³⁷⁾; 8,14)⁽³⁸⁾. Der Geliebte, der sich

⁽³²⁾ Dieser Aspekt wird von Krinetzki mit Recht unterstrichen ("Mein Herz verwandelte mich in ...", KRINETZKI, *Das Hohelied*, 188).

⁽³³⁾ Dies wird von Keel übersehen, als er die militärische Metapher der *nigdālôt* in V. 4 und 10 als Abwehr interpretiert: "(So wird) die Unzugänglichkeit, die Ferne, die Majestät, die Überlegenheit... der Geliebten beschrieben" (O. KEEL, *Deine Blicke sind Tauben* [SBS 114/115; Stuttgart 1984], 48). Diese Interpretation paßt zu 5,4.8, nicht aber, m.E., zu 6,4b.10by.

⁽³⁴⁾ "There is no doubt that 'my soul'... represents the power of love and the unconscious, the Dionysiac imperative..." (LANDY, *Paradoxes*, 205).

⁽³⁵⁾ Vgl. u.a. TOURNAY, *Langage*, 75-76; LACOCQUE, *Shulamite*, 337-338. Der "Wagen" heißt hier 'a^jgālāh: es handelt sich nicht um einen Streit-, sondern um einen von Kühen gezogenen Lastwagen.

⁽³⁶⁾ Diese Identifikation wird auch von MULDER, *Canticle*, 111-113 und LACOCQUE, *Shulamite*, 339 vorgeschlagen.

⁽³⁷⁾ Vgl. dazu HEINEVETTER, *Garten*, 140.

⁽³⁸⁾ Andere Stellen wurden oben erwähnt (vgl. Anm. 26). Auffallend ist, daß es sich oft um *cruces interpretum* handelt (vgl. 2,17; 3,10; 8,14). Ich wage zu vermuten, daß diese Stellen sich der exegetischen Akribie entzogen haben, weil sie nicht in ihrem literarischen Kontext untersucht wurden. Es

von diesem "Heer" angegriffen fühlte, versuchte am Anfang Widerstand zu leisten (V. 5: "Wende deine Augen von mir ab!"). Jetzt wechselt er die Front. Er steigt selbst auf die "Kriegswagen" seiner Feindin/Freundin, auf die Kriegswagen der Liebe. Das "Verlangen" hat diese Verwandlung vollbracht, ohne daß er wußte wie. Es handelt sich um ein "Sich-geschlagen-geben", genau wie sich die Freundin 2,4 ("Sein Banner *dægæl* über mir ist die Liebe") geschlagen gab⁽³⁹⁾.

Gerleman weist auf eine Parallele aus den altägyptischen Liebesliedern hin. Es wird dort von einem "Prinz" Mehi gesprochen, eine Art Cupido, der auf einem "Streitwagen" herumrast in Begleitung von einer Schar von "Liebesgefangenen"⁽⁴⁰⁾. Von einem "Wagen der Liebe" wird auch in der mesopotamischen Literatur gesprochen⁽⁴¹⁾. Hier aber ist, wie im Fall von Mehi, von *einem* Wagen, in unserem Text ist von einer ganzen Wagenkolonne die Rede. Außerdem wird in Mesopotamien von einem Luxuswagen, im Hld dagegen, wie auch in der altägyptischen Parallele, von "Streitwagen" gesprochen. Aber vielleicht spielen im Hintergrund solche Reminiszenzen, vor allem die ägyptische, eine Rolle.

Mit den letzten zwei Wörtern '*ammî-nādîb*' kommen wir zum eigentlichen Problem unseres Textes. Man kann sie zusammenlesen als einen Personennamen. Nur wird der Name '*ammînādîb*' nirgendwo im Hld oder auch sonst im AT erwähnt. G, Vg und einige hebräische Codices lesen "Amminadab", ein Name, der im AT gut belegt ist (Ex 6,23; Num 1,7; 2,3; 7,12.17; 10,14; Rut 4,19.20; 1 Chr 2,10; 6,7; 15,10.11), der aber keine besondere Verbindung zum Hld hat. Tournay hat vorgeschlagen, "Abinadab" zu lesen⁽⁴²⁾: Abinadab ist

ist typisch für den Verfasser des Hld, eine poetische Einheit mit einem entfremdenden, prägnanten Satz abzuschließen, der freilich nur dann verstanden werden kann, wenn er als "Schluß" und "Zusammenfassung" des Vorausgehenden betrachtet wird. Ich habe versucht, dieses Prinzip auf 3,10 anzuwenden (BARBIERO, "Liebe", [vgl. Anm. 19]).

⁽³⁹⁾ Wieder ein Fall jenes "Spiegeleffekts", auf den Elliott aufmerksam macht (vgl. oben, Anm. 23). Man beachte das Vorkommen desselben Wortes *dgl* in 2,4 und 6,4.10.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ GERLEMAN, *Das Hohelied*, 191-192; vgl. M. V. FOX, *The Song of Songs and the Ancient Egyptian Love Songs* (London 1985) 64-66; A. NICCACCI, "Cantico dei Cantici e canti d'amore egiziani", *SBFLA* 41 (1991) 61-85, bes. 75-76.

⁽⁴¹⁾ Darauf macht aufmerksam vor allem POPE, *Song*, 590-591.

⁽⁴²⁾ TOURNAY, *Langage*, 73-81.

der Mann, bei dem die Bundeslade hielt, bevor sie nach Jerusalem gebracht wurde (1 Sam 7,1; 2 Sam 6,3.4; 1 Chr 13,2). Mit den "Wagen Amminadibs" wäre dann der Wagen gemeint, auf der die Bundeslade transportiert wurde.

Man könnte vielleicht annehmen, daß G den Text so interpretiert hat. Aber dem MT ist diese Interpretation kaum zu entnehmen⁽⁴³⁾. Zum einen ist nämlich 'ammî-nādîb graphisch ziemlich verschieden von 'abînādāb. Zum anderen sind die zwei Wörter in MT getrennt geschrieben ('ammî-nādîb), während sie bei den Eigennamen 'ammînādāb oder 'abînādāb immer zusammengeschrieben erscheinen. MT hat also die zwei Wörter nicht als einen Eigennamen, sondern als zwei Substantive verstanden⁽⁴⁴⁾. Dies wird dadurch bestätigt, daß nādîb in 7,2 wiederaufgenommen wird. Die "Schulammit" wird dort als bat-nādîb "Tochter eines Edlen" angeredet.

Ich nehme die zwei Wörter 'ammî-nādîb in ihrem gewöhnlichen Sinn "mein Volk, ein edles" oder "mein edles Volk"⁽⁴⁵⁾ und sehe darin einen Hinweis auf das Volk Israel⁽⁴⁶⁾. Die Erwähnung des "Volkes" reiht sich an die zahlreichen Anspielungen auf das Land bzw. Volk Israel, die das Lied 6,4-12 charakterisieren, an. In V. 4 werden mit "Tirza" und "Jerusalem" die beiden Hauptstädte des Nord- und des Südreiches erwähnt, dadurch wird nicht nur auf die Geographie, sondern auch auf die Geschichte des Volkes angespielt. In V. 5 wird das Haar der Geliebten mit dem Galaad verglichen. In V. 6 wird das Wort haqqešûbôt "die Geschorenen" von der Parallelstelle 4,2 in hāreḥelîm "die Mutterschafe" verwandelt. Ich

⁽⁴³⁾ So mit Recht GARBINI, *Cantico*, 249.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ Viele hebräische Handschriften zeigen keinen Maqqep zwischen 'ammî und nādîb. Außerdem wird MT von Aquila (λαοῦ ἐκουσιαζομένου), Symmachos, Quinta (λαοῦ ἡγουμένου), Theodotion (λαοῦ μου ἐκουσιαζομένου) und S smtnj mrkbt' d'm' dmtjb unterstützt.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ So auch EÜ ("zu den Wagen meines edlen Volkes"). Daß vor nādîb kein Artikel steht, macht diese Übersetzung etwas ungewöhnlich, aber nicht unmöglich, vgl. GKB, §126z. Das -î von 'ammî verstehe ich als Personalsuffix der ersten Person (vgl. Theodotion: λαοῦ μου). Aquila, Symmachos und Quinta lesen offensichtlich ein *jod paragomicum*. Vgl. die Diskussion in ROBERT – TOURNAY, *Cantique*, 245-246.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Die Alternative, 'am als "Verwandte", "Stammesgenosse", also individuell, zu verstehen, könnte sich auf 7,2 stützen, aber der vorausgehende Kontext ist m.E. bestimmend (6,12 ist nämlich der letzte Vers des Liedes 6,4-12), und dieser spricht eindeutig für eine "kollektive" Interpretation des Wortes.

wage zu vermuten, daß dahinter eine Anspielung auf die Matriarchin Rahel ("das Mutterschaf") steckt⁽⁴⁷⁾. Die Frau verkörpert also nicht nur das Land, sondern auch das Volk Israel. Übrigens erscheint das Wort "Israel" in 3,7, auch dort in einem militärischen Kontext (*miggibborê jîsrā'el*).

Wenn dieses Volk "edel" *nādīb* genannt wird (vgl. 7,2), dann ist vielleicht der Stolz des Verfassers zu spüren, der, gegen die Faszination der überlegenen hellenistischen Kultur⁽⁴⁸⁾, den Wert der eigenen israelitischen betont. Für Jesus Sirach ist die Weisheit ἐν λαῷ δεδοξασμένῳ beheimatet (Sir 24,12): für das Hld hat die Liebe in einem "edlen Volk"⁽⁴⁹⁾ seine Heimat.

Die "Wagen meines edlen Volkes" sind in unserem Kontext als eine militärische Metapher zu verstehen, die synonym zu den "geordneten Heeren" (V. 4.10) steht. Im AT wird von den "Wagen Israels" vor allem in den Erzählungen von Elija und Elischa gesprochen. In 2 Kön 2,12, als Elija in den Himmel aufgenommen wird, ruft Elischa ihm zu: "Mein Vater, mein Vater, Kriegswagenkorps *rækæb* Israels und seine Gespanne!"⁽⁵⁰⁾. Dasselbe wird vom König Ioasch zu Elischa gesagt (2 Kön 13,14). Wie Galling vermutet, stand der Ehrentitel wahrscheinlich zuerst mit Elischa in Verbindung. In der Elischaerzählung ist nämlich oft von geheimnisvollen "feurigen Streitwagen und Rossen" die Rede, die für Israel kämpfen (vgl. 2 Kön 6,16-17; 7,6)⁽⁵¹⁾. Dabei handelt es sich nicht um eine irdische, sondern um eine himmlische Streitkraft. Diese überirdische

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Die Anspielungen auf das Land/Volk Israel charakterisieren weiter das Lied 7,1-11 (vgl. "Heschbon", "Bat Rabbim", "Libanonturm" V. 5; "Karmel" V. 6).

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Ich setze voraus, daß das Hohelied die kulturelle Entwicklung der hellenistischen Zeit widerspiegelt (vgl. jetzt SCHWIENHORST-SCHÖNBERGER, *Das Hohelied*, 274-275). Aber meine Interpretation ist nicht davon abhängig. Sie könnte auch zu anderen Epochen passen.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ *nādīb* bezieht sich gewöhnlich auf die oberste Schicht der Bevölkerung (vgl. *TWAT* V, 242-244 [*Conrad*]). Das gilt innerhalb eines Volkes. Wenn das "Volk" selbst als *nādīb* bezeichnet wird, dann ist an einen übertragene Sinn, im Vergleich zu den anderen Völkern zu denken.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Für diese Übersetzung vgl. K. GALLING, "Der Ehrenname Elisass und die Entrückung Elias", *ZTK* 53 (1956) 129-48, bes. 135. Die Verbindung von Hld 6,12 und 2 Kön 2,11; 13,14 wird in LACOCQUE, *Shulamite*, 338; MULDER, *Canticle*, 112 bemerkt.

⁽⁵¹⁾ Vgl. dazu G. HENTSCHEL, *2 Könige* (NEB; Würzburg 1985) 10; S. GAROFALO, *Il libro dei Re* (SB[T]; Torino 1960) 177-178; M. COGAN-H. TADMOR, *II Kings* (AB; New York 1988) 32.

Macht paßt zu den himmlischen Erscheinungen von Hld 6,10, wo die "geordneten Heere" die Sterne bezeichnen, das "himmlische Heer"⁽⁵²⁾. Andererseits ist das Wort *ʾajummāh* "furchterregend" (V. 4,10) mit *ʾēmāh* verwandt, dem "Gottesschrecken", der im heiligen Krieg die Feinde Israels überfällt (vgl. Ex 15,16; 23,27; Jos 2,9)⁽⁵³⁾. Der heilige Krieg ist wohl das ursprüngliche Szenario der "Wagen Israels" (vgl. 2 Kön 7,6-7).

Wenn meine Interpretation stimmt, dann bezieht der Verfasser die Metaphorik des heiligen Kriegs auf die Liebe. Jene numinose Macht, die Gott dem Heer Israels in der Vergangenheit verliehen hat, wird von der Geliebten verkörpert. Das kleine, verletzbares Mädchen, das in 5,7 von den "Wächtern" brutal verprügelt wird, ist im Endeffekt "furchterregend wie die geordneten Heere". Kein Wunder, denn in ihr ist die Liebe gegenwärtig, die *ʾazzāh kammāwāt* und *qāšāh kiš ʾôl* (8,6) ist. Wie man den feurigen Wagen Israels nicht widerstehen kann, so ist die Geliebte unwiderstehlich, weil die Liebe *šalhəbatjāh* "eine Flamme JHWHs" (8,6) ist.

Don-Bosco-Str. 1

Gianni BARBIERO

D - 83671 Benediktbeuern

SUMMARY

Cant 6,12 (*markəbôt ʾammî-nādīb*) is a famous *crux interpretum*. The writer of this article suggests a structural solution for the text by making it the conclusion to the passage in 6,4-12. The metaphor of the "chariots of war" is in line with other metaphors in the passage that illustrate the "fearsome" aspect of love. The idea of the "people" also has its counterpart in the preceding verses. The expression refers to 2Kgs 2,12; 13,14. The beloved arouses the sacred fear which, in the Old Testament, was typical of the "horses of fire" which made up the heavenly army of Israel.

⁽⁵²⁾ Vgl. H.-P. MÜLLER, "Begriffe menschlicher Theomorphie. Zu einigen *crucis interpretum* in Hld 6,10", *ZAH* 1 (1988) 112-121, bes. 118-121. Die Ableitung von *nidgālôt* aus akk. *dagālu(m)* ist m.E. nicht überzeugend. Aber die numinose ("theomorphe") Aura des Textes wird mit Recht betont. Dazu auch KEEL, *Blicke*, 46-53. Die "theomorphe" Dimension verbindet V. 10 und 12, wie auch die Arbeiten von Lacocque und Mulder bemerken. Es handelt sich dabei nicht um "Allegorie", sondern um eine Art "Menschwerdung", um Gottes Gegenwart in den menschlichen Erfahrungen von Liebe und Sexualität. Die "Menschwerdung" wird symbolisch im "Hinabsteigen" (V. 11) dargestellt: vom Himmel (V. 10) zur Erde, nicht nur, sondern zum "Tal" *nāḥal* (V. 11). Im "Tal", ganz unten, ist der "Himmel" gegenwärtig.

⁽⁵³⁾ Vgl. KEEL, *Das Hohelied*, 201.

Psalm 111 – Bauplan und Gedankengang *

Psalm 111 ist ein alphabetisches Akrostichon. Die Buchstaben des Alphabets eröffnen jeweils eine Zeile mit drei, höchstens vier Wörtern. Exegeten sehen in der Form des alphabetischen Akrostichons meist nur ein Hindernis für klaren Gedankenfortschritt und eine nicht besonders hoch zu schätzende Spielerei⁽¹⁾. H. Gunkel spricht bei Psalm 111 von einer "fromme(n) Übung bescheidener Kunst"⁽²⁾. Die Sätze des Psalms seien ohne Zusammenhang nebeneinandergestellt, "wie man Perlen auf eine Schnur reiht"⁽³⁾.

Selbst in die außerordentliche Hochschätzung, die A. Deissler Psalm 111 entgegenbringt, mischt sich so etwas wie Bedauern über die gewählte Form. Deissler nennt Ps 111 "ein großes Lied, ein Lied gleichsam auf den Gipfeln des Alten Bundes", doch ist es dies "trotz seiner künstlichen (weil alphabetischen) Form"⁽⁴⁾.

Die Struktur von Ps 111 ist mit der Bestimmung als alphabetisches Akrostichon keineswegs umfassend beschrieben. Meine Analy-

(*) Für Hans-Winfried Jüngling, SJ.

(1) Solche Urteile finden sich in der Literatur zu allen alphabetischen Akrosticha der Bibel. Zur Form siehe W. SOLL, "Babylonian and Biblical Acrostics", *Bib* 69 (1988) 305-323; ders., "Acrostics", *AncBD* 1 (New York 1992) 58-60, mit weiterer Literatur.

(2) Er schreibt zu Ps 111: "Ein alphabetischer Psalm, die fromme Übung einer bescheidenen Kunst. Die Aufgabe, die sich der Verfasser gesteckt hat, für jeden alphabetischen Buchstaben je eine Halbzeile zu finden, ist nicht ganz ohne Schwierigkeit: je kleiner die Einheit, die der akrostische Buchstabe beginnt, um so größer ist die Mühe." (H. GUNKEL, *Die Psalmen* [HK II/2; Göttingen 1926] 488. Ps 111 ist aufgrund seiner Form "von Anfang an nur für das Papier bestimmt", wie auch Ps 9 und 145 (H. GUNKEL-J. BEGRICH, *Einleitung in die Psalmen*. Die Gattungen der religiösen Lyrik Israels [Göttingen 1985] 67). Das ist beim Vater der Gattungsforschung keine Empfehlung eines Psalms.

(3) Gunkel, *Psalmen*, 488.

(4) A. DEISSLER, *Die Psalmen III: Ps 90-150* (Die Welt der Bibel; Düsseldorf 1965), 98. Mit seinem Enthusiasmus über Ps 111 ist Deissler recht allein geblieben. Jüngst hält H.-P. MATHYS, *Dichter und Beter*. Theologen aus spätalttestamentlicher Zeit (OBO 132; Freiburg/CH - Göttingen 1994) 257, den Psalm für "beachtenswert", jedoch erst in Kombination mit Ps 112 für "geradezu aufregend".

se wird zeigen, daß in Psalm 111 mehrere Gestaltungsprinzipien wirksam sind. Durch ihr Zusammenspiel entsteht ein Text von hoher poetischer Qualität. Das alphabetische Muster der Zeilenanfänge behindert keineswegs die innere Organisation des Textes. Es ist gleichzeitig auch mehr als eine nur formale Spielerei. Vielmehr durchdringen sich in Psalm 111 Form und Inhalt in gelungener Weise.

Es ist charakteristisch für den Psalm, daß er bei all seiner Kürze doch ein breites Spektrum biblischer Themen vor Augen führt. Er spielt auf die Heilsgeschichte vom Exodus bis zur Landgabe an, er spricht vom "Bund" (ברית) und von den "Anweisungen" (פקודים) JHWHs. In V. 10a kommen weisheitliche Themata zum Zuge. Die intertextuelle Dimension dieser Elemente, die Frage nach Zitaten, Anspielungen und Einspielungen, lasse ich bei meiner Analyse offen. Auch die weiteren Beziehungen des Psalms — zu seinem "Zwilling" (Delitzsch) Ps 112 etwa, ins 5. Psalmenbuch und in den ganzen Psalter hinein, bleiben vorerst außer acht. Meine Analyse der Struktur(en) des Psalms bietet jedoch das spezifische Koordinatensystem, in das sich die intertextuellen Bezüge in Ps 111 einordnen.

Bisherige Gliederungsversuche

Es gibt in der exegetischen Literatur einige Versuche, in Ps 111 eine über das alphabetische Muster hinausgehende Gliederung zu finden. Sie lassen sich auf zwei Grundschemata reduzieren.

Nach dem ersten Schema läßt sich in Ps 111 wie in den meisten hymnischen Texten eine Einleitung (V. 1) von einem Hauptteil (V. 2-10) unterscheiden. Hie und da wird V. 10 ganz oder in Teilen als Abgesang angesehen. Solche Vorschläge unterbreiten zB. Gunkel und Kraus in ihren Kommentaren sowie die einflußreichen Artikel von Wolff und Zimmerli⁽⁵⁾.

Einige Autoren — zB. J. Schildenberger und J. L. Mays⁽⁶⁾ — halten den Hauptteil darüber hinaus für zweigeteilt und sprechen

⁽⁵⁾ H. W. WOLFF, "Psalm 111", *Herr, tue meine Lippen auf* (hg. G. Eichholz, Bd. 5, Wuppertal – Barmen 1961) 229-249 und W. ZIMMERLI, "Zwillingspsalmen", *Wort, Lied und Gottesspruch* (FS. J. Ziegler; [Hrsg. J. SCHREINER] Würzburg 1972) 105-113; = ders., *Studien zur alttestamentlichen Theologie und Prophetie*. Gesammelte Aufsätze II, (TB 51; München 1974) 261-271.

⁽⁶⁾ J. SCHILDENBERGER, "Das Psalm-paar 111 und 112", *Erbe und Auftrag* 56 (1980) 203-207 und J. L. MAYS, *Psalms* (Interpretation; Louisville 1994).

dabei von zwei Strophen. Die Zweiteilung erfolgt unter inhaltlichem Aspekt. Zunächst sei im Psalm von den Heilstaten JHWHs die Rede, dann von seinen Anweisungen. Die Grenze wird nicht immer an der gleichen Stelle gezogen. Nach Schildenberger liegt sie zwischen V. 7a und 7b, Mays sieht sie nach V. 6⁽⁷⁾.

Die Meinungen darüber, ob V. 2 noch zur Einleitung gehört, gehen auseinander⁽⁸⁾.

Nach dem anderen Schema der Psalmgliederung gibt es in dem Text einen linearen Fortschritt in Strophen. Üblicherweise werden dabei je zwei Verse zu einer Strophe zusammengestellt⁽⁹⁾. Auftret verbindet diese Strophengliederung mit Beobachtungen zu konzentrischen Elementen und Wiederaufnahmen der ersten Strophe im weiteren Psalm. Das führt ihn zu dem Muster I 1f II 3f III 5f I' 7f III' 9 II' 10⁽¹⁰⁾.

In jüngeren und jüngsten Publikationen zu Ps 111 finden sich diese Ansätze in unterschiedlicher Brechung wieder, neben Stimmen, die eine innere Gliederung des Psalms abgesehen vom Prinzip der alphabetischen Zeilenanfänge bezweifeln.

So lobt z.B. G. Ravasi zwar Auffrets Darlegungen, unterbreitet dann jedoch einen recht eigenwilligen neuen Vorschlag⁽¹¹⁾. H.-P. Mathys knüpft beim ersten Modell an⁽¹²⁾. D. Pardee kommt nach

(7) SCHILDENBERGER, "Psalmenpaar", nimmt V. 1-2 als Einleitung und V. 3-7a.7b-10 als Strophen an. MAYS, *Psalms*, 356, rechnet mit V. 1 als Themenangabe ("the great works of the LORD") und den Strophen V. 3-6.7-10.

(8) L. C. ALLEN, *Psalms 101-150* (WBC 21; Waco, Texas 1983) 91, teilt z.B. Schildenbergers Auffassungen, rechnet jedoch nur mit V. 1 als Einleitung.

(9) Siehe z.B. J. BECKER, *Gottesfurcht im Alten Testament* (AnBib 25; Rom 1965) 272, sowie die ausführliche Analyse des Psalms bei P. AUFFRET, "Essai sur la structure littéraire des Psaumes 111 et 112", *VT* 30 (1980) 257-279.

(10) AUFFRET, "Structure littéraire", 262. Die Untersuchung Auffrets zeichnet sich durch vielfältige und genaue Beobachtungen aus. Die Integration der Beobachtungen in eine schlüssige Theorie zur Gestalt des Psalms wird jedoch durch die bei ihm offenbar von vorneherein feststehende, undiskutierte Voraussetzung gestört, daß ein durchgängiges Strophenmuster vorliegen müsse.

(11) Er rechnet mit V. 1-3 als erster Strophe ("prima strofa"), V. 4-9 als Corpus ("corpus") und V. 10 als letzter Strophe ("ultima strofa"), siehe G. RAVASI, *Il libro dei Salmi II* (Bologna 1983) 306-308.

(12) MATHYS, *Dichter*, 256-259.

einer (vielleicht zu?) subtilen Analyse der “parallelistic structure” des Psalms zu dem Ergebnis, es gebe keine Makrostruktur⁽¹³⁾. L. Alonso Schökel orientiert seine Auslegung des Psalms von vornherein thematisch⁽¹⁴⁾.

Bei diesem Stand der Forschung möchte ich nun in einem neuen Anlauf die Struktursignale des Psalms analysieren.

Wiederholungen von Lexemen und Wurzeln

Der Psalm ist geprägt von vielfältigen Lexem- und Wurzelwiederholungen. Auch der Gottesname JHWH wird wiederholt. Diese Erkenntnis ist nicht neu.

Die häufigste Wiederholung betrifft die Wurzel עשה. Sie kommt sechsmal vor, dreimal ist dabei von den מעשי (ו/יהוה/ידי) den Taten oder Werken JHWHs, die Rede. Vorgreifend kann gesagt werden, daß die Wurzel das Thema des Psalms anzeigt. Zusammen mit dem synonymen פעל (V. 3a) handeln 7 Stellen des Psalms in irgendeiner Weise vom “Tun”⁽¹⁵⁾. Die Zahl 7 ergibt sich nicht nur zufällig, wie die Darlegungen zu den Zahlen 3, 4 und 7 in Ps 111 noch zeigen werden.

Die Wiederholungen (nicht unterschieden nach Lexem, Wurzel oder Gottesnamen) seien hier im Überblick dargestellt⁽¹⁶⁾.

6 Stellen: עשה (V. 2a.4a.6a.7a.8b.10aβ)

4 Stellen: יהוה (V. 1a.2a.4b.10a)⁽¹⁷⁾

כל (V. 1a.2b.7b.10aβ)

3 Stellen: עד (V. 3b.8a.10b)

עולם (V. 5b.8a.9b)

ירא (V. 5a.9b.10a)

אמן (V. 7a.7b.8b)

⁽¹³⁾ D. PARDEE, “Acrostics and Parallelism: The Parallelistic Structure of Psalm 111”, *Maarav* 8 (1992) 117-138, darin 137: “Does this work have a macro-structure, a ‘literary’ structure, a story line, a plot line, such as may be found even in non-narrative poems?... The answer with regard to Psalm 111 is: No.”

⁽¹⁴⁾ L. ALONSO SCHÖKEL – C. CARNITI, *I Salmi*, ed. italiana a cura di A. Nepi (Commenti biblici; Rom 1993).

⁽¹⁵⁾ Dies bemerkt gut RAVASI, *Salmi II*, 308.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Eine ähnliche Liste stellt PARDEE, “Acrostics”, 122, zusammen. Er übersieht allerdings עשה in V. 10.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Die Kurzform יה aus הללו יה ist nicht mitgezählt.

An je zwei Stellen stehen ישר (V. 1b.8b); עמד (V. 3b.10b); זכר (V. 4a.5b); נתן (V. 5a.6b); בריח (V. 5b.9aß); עם (V. 6a.9a) und הלל (V. 1.10).

Insgesamt werden also 14 Elemente (Lexeme, Wurzeln, JHWH) wiederholt. 7 Lexeme oder Wurzeln kommen doppelt vor. Für einen Text von insgesamt nur 74 Wörtern ist das eine hohe Zahl von Wiederholungen⁽¹⁸⁾.

Die Konzentrik in V. 3-10

Einige der soeben aufgezählten Wiederholungen bilden ein konzentrisches Muster. Das tragende Element sind dabei die Wendungen zur "Zeit" (עד, עולם), jeweils in verschiedenen, identisch wiederholten Verbindungen.

- 3b עמדת לעד
- 5b לעולם בריתו
- 8a לעד לעולם
- 9aß לעולם בריתו
- 10b עמדת לעד

Die Konzentrik springt ins Auge.

Sie wird durch weitere Elemente gestützt.

- 3b עמדת לעד
- 4b יהוה
- 5a ליראיו
- 5b לעולם בריתו
- 6a לעמו
- 7a אמת
- 8a לעד לעולם
- 8b באמת
- 9a לעמו
- 9aß לעולם בריתו
- 9b נורא
- 10a יראת יהוה
- 10b עמדת לעד

⁽¹⁸⁾ Hier und im folgenden wird das הללו יה aus V. 1 mitgezählt. Die Frage, ob es vielleicht sekundär vorangestellt wurde, lasse ich offen. Es steht zwar außerhalb des alphabetischen Schemas, bildet jedoch mit תהלתו (V. 10b) einen Rahmen und scheint in das Zahlensystem des Psalms integriert zu sein. Nur mit ihm zusammen entstehen die 14 Wiederholungen und 7 Paarbildungen (dazu siehe unten zu den Zahlen in Ps 111).

Die Wurzel ירא aus 5a wird in 9b und 10a zweifach aufgegriffen, außerdem entsprechen sich jeweils der Gottesname JHWH (V. 4b.10a), לעמו (V. 6a.9a) und אמת (ב) (V. 7a.8b).

Die Verse 3b-10 zeigen also eine konzentrische Struktur. V. 3a ist darin durch kein eigenes Signal eingebunden. Er ist jedoch ungewöhnlich eng an V. 3b angeschlossen: es handelt sich um die einzige Verbindung zweier Sätze durch die Konjunktion ו in Ps 111. Die Untersuchung der Verse 1f wird weitere Gründe für die Zuordnung von V. 3a zu 3b-10 beibringen. Darum spreche ich — weiteren Argumenten leicht vorgreifend — von den Versen 3-10 und nicht nur 3b-10 als einer Einheit.

Die Mitte: V. 7-8

Die Mitte der konzentrischen Struktur kann nicht nur aus V. 8a bestehen, wie schon der erste Blick auf diesen Versteil zeigt. V. 8a gehört zu einer eng verbundenen Gruppe von vier Zeilen (V. 7-8). Die Verse 7 und 8 sind zweifach gerahmt: durch אמת in V. 7a.8b und durch Ableitungen der Wurzel עשה (מעשי + עשויים V. 7a.8b). V. 7a beginnt mit dem Themawort des Psalms in leichter Variation (מעשי ידיו), die drei anderen Zeilenanfänge weisen jeweils ein Partizip im Plural auf. In V. 7b ist es ein Partizip Nifal, in V. 8a.b sind es Partizipien Qal Passiv.

An V. 7-8 ist nicht nur der dreifache partizipiale Zeilenbeginn auffällig, sondern auch die dreifache Verwendung der Wurzel אמן in V. 7a.8b erfüllt Rahmenfunktion. Das Partizip nif. in 7b knüpft an אמת aus 7a und verdeutlicht die Rede von den מקוריו als Explikation der "Taten JHWHs", die אמת ומשפט sind⁽¹⁹⁾.

Weitere Untergliederungen in V. 3-10?

Die bisherrige Analyse ergab eine konzentrische Anlage der Verse 3-10. Die Verse 7 und 8 bilden darin eine formal besonders gestaltete und gerahmte Mitte. Von den Versen 1-2 sehe ich im Moment noch ab. Gibt es Indizien für eine Gliederung der Verse 3-6 und 9-10, etwa im Sinne der Strophen (V. 3-4.5-6 und 9.10), wie sie von Auffret vorgeschlagen wurden?

(¹⁹) Die Beobachtungen zur Rahmung der Mitte sowie zur Wiederholung der Wurzel אמן sprechen gegen die Grenze, die Schildenberger (sowie Allen) für ihre Zweiteilung des Psalms gerade nach 7a ansetzen.

In den Versen 3-6 gibt es zwei ineinandergreifende Wiederholungen, die gegen eine strophische Gliederung sprechen. Die Wurzel **זכר** aus V. 4a wird in 5b aufgegriffen. Damit verzahnt ist die Wiederholung von **נתן** in 5a und 6b. Eine Strophengrenze im Bereich der Verse 4-6 würde in jedem Fall eines der Paare auseinanderreißen. Auf der Ebene der strukturbildenden Wiederholungselemente ist eine weitere Unterteilung der Verse nicht sehr plausibel⁽²⁰⁾.

Vers 6 zeichnet sich durch einige Besonderheiten aus. Die zwei Zeilen des Verses sind nach V. 1a die ersten, die wiederum aus vier Wörtern bestehen⁽²¹⁾. Der Zusammenhalt der Versteile ist durch die — für den Psalm einmalige — Infinitivkonstruktion in 6b besonders eng. Das Themawort **מעשי** (**כח**) aus V. 2 (dort **מעשי יהוה**) wird aufgegriffen. Die konzentrische Struktur der Verse 3-10 ist nicht völlig symmetrisch und gibt V. 6b eine gewisse Sonderstellung. Die Abstände zwischen den strukturbildenden "Zeitangaben" sind nicht gleich. Zwar entsprechen sich die Abstände im äußeren Bereich: zwischen 3b-5b und 9ab-10b liegen jeweils drei Zeilen. Im inneren Teil V. 5b-9ab stehen jedoch vier Zeilen (zwischen 5b und 8a) gegenüber zweien (zwischen 8a und 9ab). V. 8a steht erst an dritter Stelle der vierzeiligen Psalmmitte. Für V. 6b gibt es keine Entsprechung im konzentrischen Muster der Verse.

Es gibt also Hinweise auf eine besondere Gewichtung des V. 6 im formalen Bezugssystem des Psalms⁽²²⁾. Diese Indizien genügen

⁽²⁰⁾ Auftrets Strophen gewinnen ihre Plausibilität zum großen Teil aus inhaltlichen Erwägungen. Diese Überlegungen werden jedoch zu früh angestellt, noch bevor die formal strukturanzeigenden Elemente in ihrem Zusammenspiel betrachtet wurden. Die Verse 3-4 sind für Auftret zB. eine klare Einheit. V. 3a und 4b beginnen jeweils mit Begriffspaaren, deren erstes JHWHs Tun, das zweite JHWH selbst charakterisiert. Die Verse 5-6 haben **נתן** als rahmendes Element. Die Wiederholung von **זכר** bleibt unberücksichtigt, auch die — im Blick auf die Konzentrik vorliegende — Sonderstellung von V. 3a. Zu V. 3a siehe meine Ausführungen weiter unten. Die eigentliche Entsprechung zu **זכר ורחמים יהוה** ist das **קדוש ונורא שמו** aus V. 9. Pardee meint zu Recht, daß Auftrets Strophen in dem Psalm keine Makrostruktur bilden, sondern Variationen eines Themas sind. Nach meiner Analyse ist Ps 111 jedoch auf eine Makrostruktur hin angelegt.

⁽²¹⁾ Vier Wörter weisen die Zeilen V. 1a.6a.6b.7a.10aa.10ab auf. Die Verteilung wirkt, als sei sie nach dem Schema Anfang – Mitte – Ende erfolgt.

⁽²²⁾ Man kann fragen, ob die klar abgehobene Mitte des Psalms (V. 7-8) in einem nächsten Schritt in eine Gruppe von sieben (!) Zeilen integriert ist, die von den strukturtragenden Zeilen V. 5b und 9ab begrenzt wird. Drei Zeilen (V. 6a.b.7a) bestünden dann aus je vier Wörtern, vier Zei-

jedoch nicht, um die Konzentrik zu sprengen und V. 6 gleichberechtigt an die Mitte anzuschließen. Durch לעמו 6a ordnet er sich in das System strukturbildender Momente ein. Die Symptome bleiben jedoch für die inhaltliche Auswertung der intertextuellen Bezüge bedenkenenswert.

Während also in V. 3-6 wenig für eine strophische Gliederung spricht, ist der thematische Bruch am Ende des Psalms, zwischen V. 9 und 10a geradezu überdeutlich und legt eine Grenzziehung nahe. V. 10a vollzieht eine anthropologische Wende, wie verschiedentlich bemerkt wurde. Exegeten überrascht zudem das weisheitliche (Fast)Zitat in einem Text, der so deutlich die Heilsgeschichte zum Thema hat. Trotzdem gehört V. 10 eng mit dem Vorangehenden zusammen. Zum einen fällt die anthropologische Wende des Themas nicht so stark aus dem Rahmen des Psalms, wie oft angenommen wird. Sie wird schon in der Mitte (V. 8b) vorbereitet, wenn die פקודים als "zu Tuende" charakterisiert werden (dazu siehe unten mehr). Zum andern stehen Elemente aus V. 10 in engem Zusammenhang mit Vorangegangenen. So weist das Suffix von עשיתם aus 10ab auf die פקודי V. 7b zurück. Die letzte Zeile, V. 10b, ist wie V. 9ab.5b und 3b konsequent theozentrisch⁽²³⁾. Hinzu kommt noch die Stichwortanbindung von 9b und 10a durch die Wurzel ירא. All dies schließt ein Verständnis von V. 9 und 10 als zwei Strophen nicht aus, doch zusammen mit den Beobachtungen zu den V. 3-6 scheint mir eine solche Annahme wenig plausibel.

Die Verse 3-10 sind durch Wiederholungen konzentrisch gestaltet. Die Verse 7-8 bilden darin eine klar konturierte Mitte. Für weitere Einschnitte in den Text, etwa im Sinne einer strophischen Gliederung, sprechen keine formalen Indizien.

len (V. 7b.8a.b.9a) aus je drei. Die Überlegungen zu den Zahlen drei, vier und sieben in Ps 111 (siehe weiter unten) erhöhen die Plausibilität einer solchen Annahme.

⁽²³⁾ MATHYS, *Dichter*, 257-258, bezieht das Suffix aus V. 10b auf den einzelnen Gerechten (aus den כל-עשיתם V. 10ab) und sieht in Ps 112 dann die Entfaltung dieser Aussage. Vom Duktus und der Geschlossenheit des Psalms her liegt es zunächst näher, das Suffix auf JHWH zu beziehen. Dafür sprechen der Rahmen des Psalms V. 1a und 10b, die Parallele von V. 10b mit V. 3b sowie die Tatsache, daß sich das Suffix der 3. Person sg. masc. in Ps 111 in allen anderen Fällen (V. 3a.3b.4a.5a.5b.6abis.7a.7b.9a.9ab.9b) auf JHWH bezieht.

Die Einleitung V. 1-2

Die Verse 1-2 (sowie 3a) sind nicht in die Konzentrik eingebunden. In welcher Beziehung stehen sie zum übrigen Psalm?

Zunächst bildet das außerhalb der alphabetischen Struktur stehende יה הללו mit dem ersten Wort der letzten Zeile תהלה einen äußeren Rahmen um den Psalm.

Die Verse 1-2 (ohne Hallelujah) werden durch כל in V. 1aß und 2b gerahmt. Die beiden Verse bilden nicht die erste Strophe einer linearen Psalmentwicklung, sondern sind die Einleitung des ganzen Psalms, wie die von der Gattungsforschung herkommenden Analysen schon — zumindest für V. 1 — nahelegten.

Von besonderem Interesse ist Vers 2. Er ist in seinen beiden Teilen, 2a und b, Themenangabe für den Hauptteil des Psalms V. 3-10. Ps 111 handelt von den מעשי יהוה. V. 2b bringt dabei die Beziehung der Menschen zu den מעשי יהוה in den Blick. Dieser Aspekt wird im Zentrum des Psalms (V. 8b) und an seinem Ende (V. 10a.ab) gezielt aufgegriffen. Die menschliche Antwort auf die Taten JHWHs gehört zum Thema des Psalms, auch wenn die theozentrische Perspektive dominiert.

Die Wiedergabe von V. 2b ist nicht unumstritten. In jüngerer Zeit setzt sich offenbar die Auffassung als "erforschenswert allen, die Gefallen an ihnen haben" durch⁽²⁴⁾. Die Analyse der Struktur des Psalms bringt für diese Auffassung weitere Gründe bei.

Das Verhältnis der Einleitung zum Hauptteil

Zahlreiche formale Elemente der Einleitung (V. 1-2) werden in der Mitte des Hauptteils (V. 7-8) und an seinem Ende (V. 10) aufgegriffen.

כל aus V. 1a.2b wird in V. 7b wiederholt. Einziger weiterer Beleg für כל ist V. 10ab. Die Wurzel ישר wird nur in der Einleitung (V. 1b) und in der Mitte (V. 8b) verwendet. Die Präposition

⁽²⁴⁾ So bei AUFFRET, "Structure littéraire", 258; ALLEN, *Psalms*, 88; PARDEE, "Acrostics", 118; RAVASI, *Salmi II*, 301; ALONSO SCHÖKEL, *Salmi* 2, 516. Siehe auch Joüon §121 i. Zur Diskussion siehe ALONSO SCHÖKEL, *Salmi* 2, 516, 519. Die Einheitsübersetzung hat anders entschieden und übersetzt als "kostbar". Die NJPS lautet: "within reach of all who desire them", und merkt an: "Meaning of Heb. uncertain". Zur Problematik von חפציהם siehe immer noch am besten F. DELITZSCH, *Die Psalmen* (BC 4/1; Leipzig 1894, Nachdruck Gießen-Basel 1984) 687.

ב kommt nur in V. 1a.1b und in V. 8b vor. כל, ישר, und ב verbinden Einleitung und Mitte. Darüber hinaus greift מעש ידי in V. 7a die Themaformulierung מעש יהוה V. 2a auf⁽²⁵⁾.

Weniger auffällig, bei näherem Hinsehen jedoch frappierend, ist die parallele Gestaltung der Zeilenanfänge von V. 2a.b und 7b.8a.b. Die drei Zeilen 7b.8a.8b werden jeweils mit einem Partizip Plural eröffnet (נאמנים – סמוכים – עשויים). Die Zeilenanfänge von V. 2 (גדלים – דרושים) entsprechen dem insofern, als nur in diesen fünf Fällen das Anfangswort einer Zeile mit dem Morphem ים- endet und דרושים ein weiteres Partizip Qal Passiv ist.

Die Verse 7-8 greifen den Themavers 2 unter seinem theologischen und seinem anthropologischen Aspekt auf. V. 7a-8a entfalten die Verse מעש יהוה als פקודיו. Das Partizip Passiv Qal עשויים in V. 8b kann theologisch gelesen werden: die Anweisungen sind "geschaffen" (EÜ) oder "gemacht" (Buber)⁽²⁶⁾. Die Zeile wird jedoch aussagekräftiger, wenn das Partizip gerundivisch verstanden wird: die Anweisungen sind "zu tun"⁽²⁷⁾. In diesem Fall greift עשויים das דרושים aus V. 2b auf. Die preisende Entfaltung der Taten JHWHs stößt in ihrem Zentrum auf den Punkt, an dem die Taten zum Anspruch werden. Die Anweisungen sind nicht nur zu erforschen und zu loben, sondern zu tun. Das Tun JHWHs lädt ein zum Mittun, zum Eintreten in den Raum, den es eröffnet. Die Verwendung von אמה in 7a und 8b spiegelt diesen Vorgang wieder.

Das (formal gesehen) quantitative Übergewicht der theozentrischen Perspektive bleibt bei alldem gewahrt. Den drei Zeilen über Gottes Werke steht nur eine mit Bezug auf die Menschen gegenüber. Die Zweiseitigkeit des Psalmthemas drückt sich auch in der Verwendung der thematragenden Wurzel עשה aus: zwei von sechs Belegen

⁽²⁵⁾ Auch V. 6a mit כח מעשיו weist bereits auf V. 2 zurück, doch ist V. 7a die engere Parallele.

⁽²⁶⁾ Es gibt nicht viele Parallelen, die in gleicher Weise die Gebote (Plural) mit einem schöpferischen Tun Gottes verbinden. Ps 19, zu dem es mehrere Verbindungen gibt – s. Anm. 30 –, wäre hier zu nennen. Auch er parallelisiert jedoch nur in der Sache Schöpfungsherrlichkeit und Schönheit der Tora, er spricht nicht vom 'schaffen' der Anweisungen.

⁽²⁷⁾ Die Auffassung des Partizips ist unterschiedlich. Im Sinne von "gemacht, geschaffen" verstehen zB. PARDEE, "Acrostics", 119, und AUFFRET, "Structure littéraire", 258. Gerundivisch als "zu tun, zu vollbringen" interpretieren H.-J. KRAUS, *Psalmen* (BKAT 15; Neukirchen-Vluyn 5 1978) 939; ALLEN, *Psalms*, 88-89; RAVASI, *Salmi II*, 301 und ALONSO SCHÖKEL, *Salmi 2*, 516.

sind auf menschliches Tun bezogen (V. 8b.10ab)⁽²⁸⁾. Auch die beiden Belege des JHWH-Namens im Hauptteil des Psalms ordnen sich in diese Beobachtungen gut ein (V. 4b.10a). Psalm 112 wird diese Linien weiterführen. Er wendet Aussagen, die in Ps 111 noch rein theologisch sind, auf den Gerechten an.

Die Einleitung V. 1-2 wird nicht nur in der Mitte, sondern auch am Ende des Hauptteils aufgegriffen. In der Wendung לְכָל-עֲשִׂיהֶם (10aβ) klingt das לְכָל-חַפְצֵיהֶם aus V. 2b an. Das Suffix bezieht sich auf die פְּקֻדֵי V. 7b⁽²⁹⁾. Die wahrhaft Einsichtigen und Weisen nehmen den Anspruch JHWHs durch die "Anweisungen" wahr und handeln entsprechend. Die JHWH-Furcht in dem weisheitlichen Kernsatz V. 10a ist schon auf die Gesetzesbeobachtung hin gedeutet⁽³⁰⁾. Vielleicht will der Psalm mit V. 10 schon Ansätze des 'Schriftstudiums' (zu denen er selbst zählen könnte) auf ihre Mitte, das Handeln nach den Geboten, orientieren⁽³¹⁾. Nähere Auskünfte könnten nur ausführliche Untersuchungen über דַּרְשׁ und חֲפֵץ (vgl. Ps 1,2) geben.

Umgriffen ist all das vom Lob. Der aktuellen Aufforderung zum Loben im הִלְלוּ יְיָ, dem inhaltlich das אֲוִדָה V. 1 zur Seite zu stellen ist, entspricht V. 10b: תִּהְלְתוּ עִמָּדָת לַעֲד. Das gegenwärtige

⁽²⁸⁾ In V. 4a kündigt sich so etwas vielleicht schon an. זָכַר עֲשֵׂה bedeutet ein von Gott ermöglichtes menschliches Tun/Erinnern. Zur Sonderstellung des Belegs mit פָּעַל, der zur Siebenerreihe עֲשֵׂה + פָּעַל gehört, und dem gerade im Kontext dieser Überlegungen eine eigene Logik innewohnt, siehe unten.

⁽²⁹⁾ BECKER, *Gottesfurcht*, 270-273, erwägt ausführlich die Fragen, die entstehen, weil die LXX, Peschitta und Hieronymus ein Suffix der 3.sg.fem. voraussetzen scheinen. Es gibt keinen Anlaß, den MT zu ändern.

⁽³⁰⁾ Siehe zum "nomistischen" Begriff der JHWH-Furcht Becker, *Gottesfurcht*, 262ff. JHWH-Furcht und das Tun/Befolgen der Anweisungen sind in Ps 111 offenbar fast synonym gedacht. So bezeugt der Psalm eine Synthese von Heilsgeschichte, Tora und Weisheit. Die gleiche Verbindung von Werken JHWHs und Tora, mit JHWH-Furcht dort als einem Wort für Gesetz (zusammen mit עִמָּדָת לַעֲד in V. 10), zeigt Ps 19. Er gehört neben Ps 111 mit Ps 103,18 und Ps 119 (21x) zu den drei einzigen Psalmen, die das Wort פְּקֻדִים verwenden.

⁽³¹⁾ Der Psalm wäre dann — auch — eine schriftgelehrte Selbstreflexion. Das Gefallen an den Werken JHWHs, wie sie in der Tora und den Schriften niederlegt sind, führt zum Forschen, zur Theologie. Diese stößt im Kern ihres "Gegenstandes" auf den lebendigen und konkreten Anspruch an das eigene Tun und Leben und läßt sich von daher das Ideal der wahren Gelehrtheit vorgeben.

Loben tritt ein in den Raum beständigen Gotteslobes, den JHWHs Taten eröffnen.

Die Einleitung V. 1-2 wird gezielt in der Mitte und am Ende des Psalms aufgegriffen und entfaltet. Das läßt sich an formalen Elementen ablesen und durch erste inhaltliche Überlegungen bestätigen. V. 2 gibt in seinen beiden Teilen a und b das Thema des Psalms an, das einheitlich ist (מעשי יהוה), aber zwei Seiten aufweist (Theozentrik und anthropologische Dimension). Diese zwei Seiten werden im Zentrum des Hauptteils entfaltet, wenn die מעשי יהוה als פקודיו expliziert werden. V. 10 kommt auf beides zurück.

Bemerkungen zu V. 3a

Der Rahmen um die Einleitung V. 1-2 macht es nochmals plausibler, daß V. 3a zum Hauptteil des Psalms gehört. Es bleibt jedoch die Tatsache, daß kein Signal der konzentrischen Struktur in V. 3a zu finden ist. Das Suffix 3.sg.masc. von פעלו weist zudem in die Einleitung (auf JHWH) zurück.

V. 3a ist durch die Konjunktion ו eng an 3b angeschlossen. Er hat jedoch eine bleibende Sonderstellung. Das drückt sich auch im Vokabular aus. So ist nur in dieser Zeile פעל als Synonym zu עשה gebraucht, wodurch die Siebenerreihe עשה (6x) + פעל (1x) entsteht. Auch hierin zeigt sich eine Verbundenheit bei gleichzeitiger Besonderheit.

An dieser Stelle sei einmal der Blick über den Psalmtext hinaus erlaubt. Die Verbindungen von Ps 111,3a führen in zwei verschiedene Bereiche.

Zum einen gehört הוד והדר in Motivzusammenhänge der Königsvorstellung. Die Psalmen 96,6 und besonders 104,1 stellen JHWHs königlichen Herrlichkeitsglanz im Kontext seines Schöpferseins vor Augen. So kann man vielleicht auch in V. 3a an JHWH als Schöpfer erinnert werden. Das scheint mir eine interessante Erklärung sowohl für die Sonderstellung der Zeile als auch für den Wechsel des Vokabulars zu sein.

פעל muß dabei nicht unbedingt gängiges Schöpfungsvokabular sein. Es genügt die Möglichkeit eines solchen Gebrauchs. Die konkrete Verwendung erklärt sich dann daraus, daß die Wurzel עשה in Ps 111 für andere Zwecke gebraucht wird⁽³²⁾. Vielleicht steht die

(32) Angesichts des Reflexionsniveaus von Ps 111 dürfte es nicht unwe-

Zeile nicht ganz unpassend als einzige vor der durch die "Zeitbegriffe" markierten Struktur?

Zum ändern macht die Verbindung zur Königsthematik den Versteil auch für die kontinuierliche Lektüre des 5. Psalmenbuches interessant. Legt man E. Zengers Überlegungen zum 5. Psalmenbuch zugrunde⁽³³⁾, so könnte V. 3a sich programmatisch auf Ps 110 zurückbeziehen. Gegenüber dessen teilweise gewaltbestimmten Vorstellungen würde nun die wirkliche Herkunft und Quelle dauerhafter Königsherrlichkeit beim gnädigen und barmherzigen JHWH unterstrichen.

Die Zahlen 3, 4 und 7 in Ps 111

Psalm 111 wird nicht nur von dem alphabetischen Muster seiner Zeilenanfänge und von der bislang entwickelten Struktur geprägt. Er ist offenbar auch bewußt immer wieder auf bestimmte Zahlen hin konstruiert.

Der Umfang der einzelnen Zeilen ist durchgängig auf drei oder vier Wörter beschränkt⁽³⁴⁾. Die Zahlen drei, vier und ihre Summe, sieben (sowie deren Vielfache) prägen den Psalm nun in einer geradezu verblüffenden Weise. Offenbar war dem Verfasser die Beschränkung durch die alphabetischen Zeilenanfänge und die Knappheit der Zeilen nicht schwierig genug, um seine Kunst daran zu erweisen.

a) Insgesamt hat der Psalm (mit dem Hallelujah) 74 (70 + 4) Wörter⁽³⁵⁾.

b) Die Zahl der verwendeten Wurzeln und Lexeme zusammen mit dem JHWH-Namen gezählt ist genau 49 (7x7).

sentlich sein, daß mit $\pi\omega$ auch das Eintreten der Menschen in göttliches Tun ausgedrückt wird. Vielleicht wird nicht zufällig das Handeln des königlichen Schöpfers davon abgesetzt.

⁽³³⁾ E. ZENGER, "Komposition und Theologie des 5. Psalmenbuchs 107-145", *BN* 82 (1996) 97-116.

⁽³⁴⁾ Sechs Zeilen umfassen vier Wörter (V. 1a.6a.6b.7a.10aa.10aß), die restlichen sechzehn Zeilen je drei Wörter.

⁽³⁵⁾ Man kann versucht sein, hier 70 Wörter + 4x den JHWH-Namen zu sehen. Doch muß man dabei das π aus dem Hallelujah außer acht lassen, und das scheint doch nicht ganz zulässig.

c) 14 (2x7) Wörter bzw. Wurzeln sowie der Gottesname werden ein- oder mehrmals wiederholt. 7 Wörter bzw. Wurzeln werden je zweimal verwendet; 4 (עד, עולם, ירא, אמן) je dreimal (siehe dazu im einzelnen die Liste der Wiederholungen weiter oben.)

d) Die häufigste Wiederholung betrifft die Wurzel עשה (6x). Die Vervollständigung dieser Reihe durch פעל (V. 3a) zu einer Siebenerreihe hat nach den Darlegungen hohe Plausibilität.

e) Im Psalm werden drei einkonsonantige Partikel verwendet: ב, ו, ו. 3x — V. 1bis.8

7x ו — V. 1.3bis.4.7.8.9.

14x ל — V. 2.3.4.5bis.6tris.8bis.9bis.10bis.

f) 7 Verbformen haben JHWH zum Subjekt (V. 4 עשה 5; נתן; 5b צוה 9b; שלח 9a; לתת 6b; הגיד 6a; יזכר 5b).

Diese Zahlen verführen dazu, buchstäblich nichts in Ps 111 mehr für Zufall zu halten. Es liegt relativ nahe, auch mit 7 Partizipien⁽³⁶⁾ und 7 Adjektiven⁽³⁷⁾ zu rechnen, doch gehen diese Zahlen nicht völlig glatt und eindeutig auf. Problematisch ist beispielsweise נרא (V. 9b): gilt es im Rahmen der Zählungen des Psalms nun als Adjektiv (analog zur Parallele 4b mit חנן ורחום) oder als Partizip? Wie werden Verbaladjektive wie יראי gewertet? Wir verlassen hier den sicheren Boden.

Auch im Fall des Suffix 3.sg.masc., das 13x mit Bezug auf JHWH verwendet wird⁽³⁸⁾, ist man versucht, eine ergänzende 14. Stelle herbeizuwünschen. Ich sehe aber keine Möglichkeit, sie zu finden. Das Suffix 3.pl.masc. kommt übrigens wieder 3x vor (V. 2b. 6b. 10ab).

Diese Beobachtungen belegen ausreichend, daß in Psalm 111 bewußt Zahlenreihen von 3, 4, 7 und Vielfachen von 7 angelegt wurden. Das Phänomen ist aus anderen Psalmen und auch Büchern wie dem Deuteronomium und dem Buch der Sprichwörter bekannt. Es gilt als Ausdruck von Gelehrtheit.

⁽³⁶⁾ 7 Partizipien sind 2b דרושים; 3b עמדת; 7b נאמנים; 8a סמוכים; 8b עשירים; 10ab עשירים; 10b עמדת. Fraglich scheint mir, ob das Pt.nif. נרא V. 9b mitzuzählen ist.

⁽³⁷⁾ Man könnte als 7 Adjektive zählen; 1b ישרים; 2a גדלים; 4b חנן ורחום; 8b ישר; 9b קדוש; 10ab טוב, doch bleiben Unsicherheiten. Was ist mit יראי?

⁽³⁸⁾ V. 3a.3b.4a.5a.5b.6a(2x).7a.7b.9a.9ab.9b.10b.

Zusammenfassung

Die Analyse der Strukturmerkmale von Psalm 111 zeigt, daß wir es mit einem außergewöhnlichen Text zu tun haben. Drei verschiedene formale Gestaltungsgesetze werden im Text miteinander kombiniert. Jedes davon ist mit einem hohen Maß an Kunstfertigkeit durchgeführt. Von einer gegenseitigen Behinderung ist nichts zu spüren.

So haben wir es mit einem alphabetischen Akrostichon zu tun, das durch die radikale Beschränkung der Zahl der Wörter pro Zeile auf drei bis vier schon in sich eine schwierige Aufgabe bietet. In einigen Zeilen wird der alphabetische Anfangsbuchstabe obendrein signifikant wiederholt⁽³⁹⁾.

Unabhängig davon wurde dem Text durch Wiederholungen (von Lexemen, Wurzeln, dem Gottesnamen) eine klare Struktur gegeben. Auf das vorangestellte Hallelujah folgen eine Einleitung (V. 1-2) und ein Hauptteil (V. 3-10). Der Hauptteil ist konzentrisch um die Mitte aus den Versen 7-8 angeordnet. Die Einleitung wird in der Mitte und am Ende des Psalms wieder aufgegriffen. Sie gibt in V. 2 das Thema an. Gerahmt wird der ganze Psalm durch הללו יה V. 1 und תהללו V. 10b.

Zusätzlich zu diesen beiden Strukturprinzipien läßt sich noch ein offenbar bewußtes Interesse an Zahlen entdecken. Die Zahlen drei, vier und sieben (mit deren Vielfachen) prägen den Psalm. Schon bei einem nicht durch weitere Formgesetze bestimmten sinnvollen Text von 74 Wörtern würden die erzielten Zahlenreihen als kunstvoll gelten.

Die scheinbar mühelose Kombination dieser verschiedenen Gestaltungsprinzipien ist bewundernswert.

Das alphabetische Muster und die verborgenere Wirksamkeit der Zahlen 3, 4 und 7 deuten beide auf einen Willen hin, Umfassendes und Vollkommenes auszudrücken. Es gilt bei alphabetischen Akrosticha für ausgemacht, daß sie durch die Orientierung an den Grundelementen der Schrift auf die Menge alles Sagbaren, die intelligible Welt als Ganze, zielen. Ähnliches gilt im Bereich der Zahlen

(39) Das ist bei den Konsonanten ה, ח, ל und מ der Fall. Die Wiederholung der Konsonanten ג, ד, ט und ת in den entsprechenden Zeilen wirkt weniger auffällig. Solche Wiederholungen unterstreichen den Charakter als alphabetisches Akrostichon.

und ihrer Symbolik für 3, 4 und 7⁽⁴⁰⁾. Psalm 111 zielt in äußerster Knappheit doch auf das Ganze.

Das vierfach wiederholte כּל unterstreicht den Zug des Psalms zum Umfassenden, ebenso wie die je dreimal wiederholten "Zeitbegriffe" עַד und עוֹלָם, deren gewichtige Kombination das Zentrum des Psalms ausmacht.

Eine sorgfältige Untersuchung der intertextuellen Beziehungen des Psalms, seiner Anspielungen und Zitate, wird einen vergleichbaren inhaltlichen Zug belegen können: das Bemühen um theologische Synthese. Der Psalm verbindet Heilsgeschichte und Weisheit durch die Mittlerschaft des Gesetzes. Unter dem Leitwort "Tun" verknüpft er durch die "Anordnungen" (der Tora) Theologie und Anthropologie miteinander. Gottes Tun eröffnet dabei den Raum, in den das menschliche Tun eintreten kann und soll.

Psalm 111 lädt zum meditierenden Nachgehen ein. Er spricht von den Taten und Werken des gnädigen und barmherzigen, heiligen und furchtbaren Gottes, die an der Herrlichkeit des Himmels abzulesen sowie dem Zeugnis der Geschichte zu entnehmen sind, die zuinnerst als Ansprüche im Alltag nahe kommen und Antwort im eigenen Tun fordern. Psalm 111 bietet gelehrte Theologie, ohne spekulativ zu werden. Alle Kunstfertigkeit des Psalms ist darauf gerichtet, den persönlichen Anspruch Gottes als Mitte der Theologie nahe zu bringen. Daß es diesen Anspruch gibt, der den Raum wahren Lebens erst eröffnet, ist dem Psalmdichter Grund zu Lob und Freude.

Donau-Schwaben-Str. 2
D-94036 Passau

Ruth SCORALICK

SUMMARY

In psalm 111 three different formal principles can be discerned, each employed with consummate artistry. The psalmist develops an acrostic and a concentric structure as well as displaying an interest in numbers. In this way he expresses a desire for completeness. The same purpose underlies his combining of salvation history with wisdom through the medium of the law.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Die Siebenzahl kann auf umfassende Vollständigkeit und Totalität zielen. Siehe dazu ausführlich E. OTTO, שבע, *TWAT* VII, 1000-1027 (mit weiteren Literaturangaben).

Linguistic Patterns of Deuteronomy 32

For almost two centuries now, the energies of numerous biblical critics have focused on the date of origin of the poem in Deut 32,1-43 (the so-called Song of Moses)⁽¹⁾. Every conceivable period in the history of Israel ranging from Mosaic to post-exilic has been proposed by at least one biblical critic only to be refuted with a counterproposal by another⁽²⁾. These critical propositions for dating the poem comprise of four types: literary, linguistic, historical and theological-religious.

Recently, I analyzed the strophic and rhetorical structure in the poem in order to determine the literary type (*Gattung*) as an aid for resolving the date of the poem⁽³⁾. In addition, I offered an interpretation of the religious sense of the poem, not as an object of interest in itself, but as a guide to dating. Now, I would like to consider the philological characteristics in the poem in order to determine if they provide clues for dating it. The historical references, or rather, allusions will be dealt at a later time.

Generally speaking, to establish the date of a specific passage of the Hebrew Bible based solely on a philological analysis is quite a hazardous undertaking. Indeed, our information on the use and development of Biblical Hebrew (and other Semitic languages or dialects related to Hebrew) is nowhere near adequate to permit its use as a basis for dating. Nevertheless, critical research on the evolution of linguistic features of Biblical Hebrew has produced in modern times several important studies⁽⁴⁾. The fundamental views

(1) For the most recent survey of the history of research, see P. SANDERS, *The Provenance of Deuteronomy 32* (OTS 37; Leiden 1996) 1-98; two other useful studies are J. H. CHONG, *The Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32:1-43) and the Hoshea-Pekah Conflict* (unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Emory University [USA] 1990) 1-50; and S. A. NIGOSIAN, *The Song of Moses (Deut. 32:1-43)* (unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, McMaster University [Canada] 1975) 4-40.

(2) For a collocation of proposed dates, see NIGOSIAN, *The Song*, 5-7.

(3) S. A. NIGOSIAN, "The Song of Moses (Dt 32): A Structural Analysis", *ETL* 72 (1996) 5-22.

(4) Among others, see: D. A. ROBERTSON, *Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry* (SBLDS 3: Missoula 1972); R. POLZIN, *Late Biblical*

and arguments introduced in these studies have been taken into account in a recent work on Deut 32 by P. Sanders⁽⁵⁾. What seems to emerge from Sanders' analysis is that although a number of procedures have been refined by recent critics, some of the basic approaches of earlier scholars (such as D.A. Robertson, W.F. Albright, F.M. Cross, D.N. Freedman, and M. Dahood) are not totally unfounded⁽⁶⁾. Consequently, I shall adopt discriminately a number of these basic linguistic approaches in search for patterns calculated to reveal the date of origin of Deut 32.

Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose (HSM 12; Missoula 1976); E.Y. KUTSCHER, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (Leiden 1982); L. MCFALL, *The Enigma of the Hebrew Verbal System* (HTIBS 2; Sheffield 1982); W.G.E. WATSON, *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques* (Sheffield 1986); F.I. ANDERSEN—A.D. FORBES, *Spelling in the Hebrew Bible* (BibOr 41; Rome 1986); E.R. FOLLIS (ed.), *Directions in Biblical Hebrew Poetry* (JSOTSS 40; Sheffield 1987); J. BARR, *The Variable Spellings of the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford 1989); N.M. WALDMAN, *The Recent Study of Hebrew: A Survey of the Literature with Selected Bibliography* (Winona Lake 1989); G.A. RENDSBURG, *Linguistic Evidence for the Northern Origin of Selected Psalms* (SBLMS 43; Atlanta 1990); I. YOUNG, *Diversity in Pre-Exilic Hebrew* (FAT 5; Tübingen 1993); A. SÁENZ-BADILLOS, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (Cambridge 1993); W.G.E. WATSON, "Problems and Solutions in Hebrew Verse: A Survey of Recent Work", *VT* 43 (1993) 372-384; G.A. RENDSBURG, "Linguistic Variation and the 'Foreign' Factor in the Hebrew Bible", *IsrOrSt* 15 (1995) 177-190; A. GIANTO, "Variations in Biblical Hebrew", *Bib* 77 (1996) 493-508.

⁽⁵⁾ SANDERS, *The Provenance*, 132-352.

⁽⁶⁾ ROBERTSON, *Linguistic Evidence*; W.F. ALBRIGHT, "The Oracles of Balaam", *JBL* 63 (1944) 207-233; id., "Some Remarks on the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy XXXII", *VT* 9 (1959) 339-346; id., *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (Garden City, NY 1968); F.M. CROSS, "The Song of the Sea and Canaanite Myth", *JThC* 5 (1968) 1-25; id., *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, MA 1973); F.M. CROSS—D.N. FREEDMAN, "The Blessing of Moses", *JBL* 67 (1948) 191-210; F.M. CROSS—D.N. FREEDMAN, *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry* (SBLDS 21; Missoula 1973); F.M. CROSS—D.N. FREEDMAN, "A Royal Song of Thanksgiving: II Sam 22 = Ps. 18", *JBL* 72 (1953) 15-34; F.M. CROSS—D.N. FREEDMAN, "The Song of Miriam", *JNES* 14 (1955) 237-250; D.N. FREEDMAN, "Archaic Forms in Early Hebrew Poetry", *ZAW* 72 (1960) 101-107; M. DAHOOD, *Proverbs and Northwest Semitic Philology* (Rome 1963); id., "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography, II", *Bib* 45 (1964) 393-412.

The procedure to examine the philological characteristics of the poem in Deut 32 involves the analysis of the following four linguistic elements: (1) Syntax and Morphology; (2) Parallelism and Assonance; (3) Metrical Structure; and (4) Terminology. The omission of Hebrew orthography from the list is deliberate. The principles and development of Hebrew orthography are not conclusively established yet⁽⁷⁾. So, until conclusive evidence is available and until the principles of Hebrew orthography are more fully understood, the method remains an uncertain instrument for probing and for locating the date of Deut 32⁽⁸⁾. The other four linguistic characteristics, however, promise more conclusive analysis of Deut 32 and are examined in turn as follows.

Each analysis is prefaced by an explanation of the linguistic element in question and the method by which it is exploited to reveal the date of the poem. This method of analysis is then applied and conclusions drawn. Finally, an overall evaluation of the results is tabulated so that the philological pattern of the poem may be appreciated in a wider perspective.

As a general rule, the analysis throughout this article is governed by Robertson's division of two linguistic poles: *early* (13th to 10th century BCE) and *late* (8th century BCE and after)⁽⁹⁾. Thus,

(7) The study of Hebrew orthography by F.M. CROSS—D.N. FREEDMAN, *Early Hebrew Orthography: A Study of the Epigraphic Evidence* (AOS 36; New Haven 1952) 45-60, leads them to identify three stages in the development of Hebrew orthography: (1) purely consonant script antedates the 9th century BCE; (2) the final *matres lectionis* is associated with the period between the 9th century BCE and the exile; and (3) both final and medial *matres lectionis* are characteristic of the period during and after the exile. But as BARR, *Variable Spellings*, 192-194 has pointed out, it is hardly possible to assign the date of a specific passage on the basis of its plene/defective spellings. Also, see criticism of D.W. GOODWIN, *Text-Restoration Methods in Contemporary U.S.A. Biblical Scholarship* (Naples 1969) 29-43. It is interesting to note that D.N. FREEDMAN, "Divine Names and Titles in Early Hebrew Poetry", *Magnalia Dei, The Mighty Acts of God. Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright* (eds. F.M. CROSS—W.M. LEMKE—P.D. MILLER) (New York 1976) 79, dates Deut 32, on the basis of the use of divine titles to the "tenth century or later".

(8) An attempt, however, has been made by SANDERS, *The Provenance*, 323-332.

(9) ROBERTSON, *Linguistic Evidence*, 9-55. For a review of this book, see N.M. SARNA, *JBL* 95 (1976) 126-129. For a critical evaluation (and

each of the four philological types establishes the linguistic patterns of *early* and *late* poetic Hebrew, followed by an analysis in order to indicate the linguistic features of Deut 32. The presence of characteristics that are typical of *either* an early or late poetic Hebrew are accepted as evidence of an *early* or *late* date respectively. However, the presence of a *mixture* of early and late patterns constitutes evidence of either *archaizing* or the *transitional period* (10th to 8th century BCE). In this event, the two possibilities are considered under each type and eventually in the overall evaluation of the results.

I. Syntax and Morphology

One of the most important syntactical and morphological studies related to the dating of Deut 32 (and other biblical poems) is that of D. A. Robertson⁽¹⁰⁾. His purpose is to determine whether any Hebrew poetry can be dated by linguistic evidence as “early” poetic Hebrew — the period from the time of the exodus in the 13th century BCE to the establishment of the monarchy in the 10th century BCE. The result of his study leads him to conclude that Deut 32 (and certain other poems) can be ascribed to the 11th to 10th century BCE⁽¹¹⁾.

According to Robertson⁽¹²⁾, the syntactical patterns of Deut 32 consist of the following characteristics:

endorsement) of Robertson’s arguments, see SANDERS, *The Provenance*, 297-319.

⁽¹⁰⁾ ROBERTSON, *Linguistic Evidence*, 9-55.

⁽¹¹⁾ ROBERTSON, *Linguistic Evidence*, 155.

⁽¹²⁾ Robertson’s procedures include the following. First, he chooses alternative terms to identify the two verbal forms which are normally identified by the terms “imperfect” and “perfect”. Since these two terms relate to grammatical usage rather than to the physical structure of verbal forms he labels them respectively, “prefix conjugation” (abbreviated to pref conj) and “suffix conjugation” (abbreviated to suff conj). This alternative offers to Robertson an additional advantage: the addition of the conjunction *w* as a prefix; that is, pref, *w*-pref, suff, and *w*-suff. Second, all passages which do not refer to past time beyond reasonable doubt are excluded from his analysis. Third, all “B-stem”, 3rd masculine singular and plural forms of initial *y/w* verbs are excluded, because on the basis of the consonantal text it is impossible to distinguish the suffix from the prefix conjugation. All verbs in subordinate clauses are also omitted for the sake of consistent linguistic method.

17 pref (vv. 8.10[4x].11[5x].12.13.14.16[2x].17.18) ⁽¹³⁾;

9 w-pref (vv. 13.15[4x].18.19[2x].20), of which 4 are initial and 5 are medial;

3 suff (v. 15[3x]) ⁽¹⁴⁾.

Next, Robertson's analysis of the morphological features of Deut 32 indicate that there are:

- one early instance of the preservation of the syllable-opening *y/w* (v. 37) and three late (standard) instances of the loss of *y/w* (vv. 3.38. 39);
- no instances of derivatives of the proto-Semitic elements *d* (*z*) which can be cited for Deut 32, although there is one instance of the relative pronoun *šr* (v. 38), which is usually considered a late characteristic;
- three instances (older forms) of affixing 3ms pronominal suffix *-anhū* (all in v. 10);
- four early instances of 3mpl pronominal suffix *-mw* (vv. 27.32.37. 38), and eleven late instances of 3mpl pronominal suffix *-m* (vv. 5. 20.26.29.30.31.32.33.35.38).

But, Robertson's result in this last case is incorrect. Applying his early/late morphological patterns to the Song yields the following results:

Early date

3mpl pronominal suffix *-mw*
with nouns 4x (vv. 27.32.37.38)

Either early or late period

3mpl pronominal suffix *-mw*
with prepositions 3x (vv. 23.32.35)

Late date

3mpl pronominal suffix *-hm*
with nouns 2x (vv. 21.26)
with prepositions 2x (vv. 20.28)

3mpl pronominal suffix *-m*
with nouns 11x (vv. 5.17.20.29.30.31.32.33.35[2x].38)
with verbs 7x (vv. 17[2x]. 21[2x].30[2x]. 38)
with prepositions 4x (vv. 20.23.24.38)

⁽¹³⁾ For the prefix conjugation as a narrative tense in Ugaritic, see M. SMITH, *The Origins and Development of the Waw-Consecutive: Northwest Semitic Evidence from Ugarit to Qumran* (HSS 39; Atlanta 1991) 5-6, 11, 65-67; J. TROPPER, "Das altkanaanäische und ugaritische Verbalsystem", *Ugarit: Ein ostmediterranes Kulturzentrum im Alten Orient* (Hrsg. M. DIETRICH-O. LORETZ) (Münster 1995) 159-170.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Cf. F. C. FENSHAM, "The Use of the Suffix Conjugation and the Prefix Conjugation in a Few Old Hebrew Poems", *JNSL* 6 (1978) 9-18.

Robertson also fails to mention the one early instance of -y morpheme (v. 13).

Thus, the corrected syntactical and morphological features of the Song may be tabulated as follows:

Syntactical and Morphological Features

	Early	Late
Syntax	17 pref conj 5 med. w-pref	9 w-pref conj 4 init. w-pref
Morphology	1 y/w root 3 -anhū pron suff 4 -mw 3mpl pron suff 1 -y morph.	3 y/w root 1 ʔšr 26 -hm/-m 3 mpl pron suff

This summary clearly confirms the presence of both early and late syntactical and morphological forms of Deut 32. Though the data falls short of yielding conclusive evidence of the date of Deut 32, the analysis does at least narrow the field for identifying the period which accounts for a mixture of patterns.

If the poem is considered characteristic of late poetic Hebrew, then the presence of all the instances of early forms, such as the prefix conjugations, the preservation of the y/w root and the instances of the older forms -anhū and -mw, must be regarded as evidences of archaizing. Such a conclusion may be legitimate, but it certainly is not unequivocal. The proportion of prefix conjugations seems to be high, so that it is unjustifiable to assume confidently that all these early forms are the result of conscious archaizing on the part of the author of Deut 32⁽¹⁵⁾.

If, on the other hand, the poem belongs in the early poetic Hebrew category (as suggested by Robertson)⁽¹⁶⁾, then the presence of a significant number of standard forms has to be explained. For instance, how is the presence of nine w-prefix conjugations or the twenty-six instances of -hm/m 3mpl pronominal suffixes to be explained?

⁽¹⁵⁾ A. NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose* (JSOTSS 86; Sheffield 1990) 194, explains that the occurrence of free forms of the prefix conjugation expressing the narrative value is archaic and found only in poetry of the Hebrew Bible.

⁽¹⁶⁾ ROBERTSON, *Linguistic Evidence*, 153-156.

It is possible that the presence of early and late forms in significant numbers represents poetic composition during a "period of transition" from early to late poetic Hebrew. Characteristics of poetry in such a period might be the frequent occurrence, rather than mere vestigial instances, of older forms associated with early patterns and the frequent occurrence of younger forms which, as a result of gradually increasing popularity, become characteristic of late poetic Hebrew. If this is the case, then the most appropriate period to match the description "period of transition" is the period between the 10th and the 8th centuries BCE.

II. Parallelism and Assonance

There is no ancient Israelite manual governing the rules of Hebrew poetry. Hence, the principles that guide the stylistic analysis for dating biblical poems are strictly based on comparative study. The nature of Hebrew poetry is often compared to Canaanite, Babylonian and Egyptian poetry, which then assists in the inference of distinctions between chronological stages. Thus, by studying the poetic techniques of the literature of the ancient Near East, scholars construct a model on which they base a theory of stylistic sequence-dating in Israel. "We can now parallel", says Albright, "changing poetic style with historically meaningful content, a method which gives us approximate dates for stylistic modifications" (17).

The starting point of this principle goes back to Lowth's theory of *parallelismus membrorum* (18). His views can be reduced to two general rules. First, poetic verses consist of two, and sometimes three, colons (e.g., Ps 94,3; 93,3). Second, the structural principle in poetic verses is parallelism. This relationship of parallelism to colons

(17) ALBRIGHT, *Yahweh and the Gods*, 3.

(18) R. LOWTH, *De sacra poesi hebraeorum: praelectiones academicae Oxonii habitae* (Oxonii 1821); Engl. transl. with revisions of the original *Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews* (London 21847) 210-221. Recent discussions on parallelism include: S.A. GELLER, *Parallelism in Early Biblical Poetry* (HSM 20; Missoula 1979); M. O'CONNOR, *Hebrew Verse Structure* (Winona Lake 1980); J.L. KUGEL, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and Its History* (New Haven 1981); A. BERLIN, *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism* (Bloomington 1985); D. PARDEE, *Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetic Parallelism: A Trial Cut* (VTS 39; Leiden 1988).

may be one of three kinds: *synonymous*, in which the second colon repeats the content of the first in different words (e.g., Ps 1,2); *antithetic*, in which the second colon contrasts the content of the first in order to illuminate the idea (e.g., Ps 1,6); and *synthetic*, in which the second colon supplements or strengthens the thought of the first (e.g., Ps 66,4). Lowth's analysis was later supplemented by a fourth category: *climactic*, to include all those instances in which the second colon completes the thought of the first (e.g., Ps 29,8)⁽¹⁹⁾.

Realizing the importance of the stylistic characteristic of parallelism, W.F. Albright selects and analyzes a group of Canaanite and biblical material⁽²⁰⁾. His observation, however, leads him to coin a new term: *repetitive parallelism*. This shift in terminology is indicative of a shift in the method itself. Unlike his predecessors, Albright does not restrict his definition to an initial colon that completes itself in a second or third colon but includes all those verses in which the same words recur in two colons of one verse (e.g., Ha 3,2). This repetitive pattern leads Albright to consider next the possibility of dating biblical poems⁽²¹⁾. He argues that the poetic device of repetitive parallelism, a striking feature in Canaanite poetry, is characteristic of "early" biblical poetry; this was later replaced by other stylistic features, such as assonance and paronomasia, which become the distinguishing features of a "later" period⁽²²⁾. Thus, the presence of repetitive parallelism in any given Hebrew poem is evidence of an "early" date; the absence of repetitive parallelism and/or the presence of assonance and paronomasia is an indication of a "late" date.

Albright proceeds next to consider the incidence of repetitive parallelism in various Hebrew poems. Judging from stylistic indications, he classifies the following among the earliest Israelite poetry: the Song of Miriam (Exod 15), the Song of Deborah (Judg

⁽¹⁹⁾ For the development of these terms see S.E. LOWENSTAMM, "The Expanded Colon in Ugaritic and Biblical Verse", *JSS* 14 (1969) 176-179.

⁽²⁰⁾ W.F. ALBRIGHT, "The Psalm of Habakkuk", *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy Presented to Th.H. Robinson* (ed. H.H. ROWLEY) (Edinburgh 1950) 3-9.

⁽²¹⁾ ALBRIGHT, *Yahweh and the Gods*, 1-46; id., "Some Remarks", 339-346.

⁽²²⁾ J.J. GLÜCK, "Paronomasia in Biblical Literature", *Semitics* 1 (1970) 50-78, considers that the stylistic device of paronomasia was an integral part of biblical literature.

5), and the oracles of Balaam (Num 23–24)⁽²³⁾. The Song of Moses (Deut 32) and the Blessing of Moses (Deut 33), however, represent to Albright an intermediate type with less frequent instances of repetitive parallelism. Pressed to determine more precisely the date of Deut 32, he states that it “probably dates from about 1025 B.C.”⁽²⁴⁾. His conclusion is based on the following five instances of repetitive parallelism and nine instances of assonance:

Repetitive Parallelism

- v. 2—repetition of two prepositions
- v. 6—repetition of a pronoun
- v. 17—repetition of a verb⁽²⁵⁾
- v. 39—repetition of a personal pronoun
- v. 43—repetition of a verb⁽²⁶⁾

Assonance

- v. 6—repetition of suffixes
- v. 21—two words appear in different forms
- v. 22—phonetically similar words

Of the six instances of assonance Albright unfortunately cites only these three. He fails to mention three other instances of assonance in the poem: repetition of verbal suffixes in verses 10, 11 and 15.

Albright's view seems justified to a degree. Judging from stylistic indications, there is no archaic parallelism in Deut 32 similar to the parallelism found in Judg 5, Exod 15, or Canaanite material. Nevertheless, there are five instances of repetitive parallelism which, as Albright has rightly observed, are “echoes” of

⁽²³⁾ ALBRIGHT, *Yahweh and the Gods*, 9-17.

⁽²⁴⁾ ALBRIGHT, *Yahweh and the Gods*, 17. Note, however, that this is Albright's third and latest view on the date of the Deut 32. His two previous dates were the 17th century BCE and the 10th century BCE respectively in the two editions of his book, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (New York 1940, 1957) 227, 296.

⁽²⁵⁾ For Albright's proposal to emend the MT of v. 17, see ALBRIGHT, “Some Remarks”, 341-342.

⁽²⁶⁾ For Albright's textual restoration of v. 43, see ALBRIGHT, “Some Remarks”, 339-341.

the archaic pattern. The presence of six instances of assonance, on the other hand, points towards the period when paronomasia and assonance tend to replace the earlier repetitive style. Consequently, the stylistic characteristic of the poem is a mixture of parallelism and assonance.

This mixture of stylistic characteristics in the poem rules out either an early or a late date. Certainly one cannot ascribe an early date since the instances of repetitive parallelism lack the distinctive Canaanite pattern. Similarly, one cannot ascribe a late date since the presence of the repetitive style has to be accounted for. Hence, the poem can be thought to derive from a time when both poetic features were in common use. That the nature of repetitive parallelism in the poem is simply an "echo" of the archaic pattern of the 17th to 15th century BCE is an indication of a change of style down through the centuries. Precisely how much time elapsed before usage established assonance in place of the archaic pattern is difficult to determine. One conclusion, however, is clear: the poem contains a mixture of both patterns. This suggests most probably an intermediate period between the 10th and the 8th centuries BCE.

III. Metrical Structure

The prosodic pattern of Ugaritic meter is identified by F. M. Cross as one of the factors for determining the date of certain Hebrew poems⁽²⁷⁾. Preferring to speak of blocks of short or long colons, for which he uses the terms *brève* and *longum*, Cross concludes that mixed meter of *longum* and *brève* "is typical of Ugaritic epic style. In pure form it is found only in the earliest Hebrew poetry, notably the Song of the Sea, the Song of Deborah, the Lament of David, and Psalm 29"⁽²⁸⁾.

Cross proceeds next to demonstrate that the characteristic style of the Song of the Sea (Exod 15) is typical of the Ugaritic prosodic pattern of mixed meter. This characteristic of mixed metrical structure, according to Cross, conforms to the prosodic patterns of the Late Bronze Age. Furthermore, the baroque use of climatic parallelism, internal rhyme and assonance in the Song of the Sea

⁽²⁷⁾ CROSS, *Canaanite Myth*. For a refutation of Cross's typology, see O'CONNOR, *Hebrew Verse*, 29-54.

⁽²⁸⁾ CROSS, *Canaanite Myth*, 115-116.

associate it with the Song of Deborah (Judg 5), the Lament of David (2 Sam 1), the Blessing of Moses (Deut 33), Jacob's prophecy for his sons (Gen 49), David's Song of Deliverance (2 Sam 22 = Ps 18), and Ps 29, all of which may be dated around the 11th to 10th century BCE⁽²⁹⁾.

It is interesting to note that Cross does not include the poem in Deut 32 in his comparative list of early poems. The reason he offers is that in his opinion Deut 32 cannot date any earlier than the 9th century BCE⁽³⁰⁾. He does not offer any evidence for his conclusion, nor any record that he analyzed the metrical pattern of Deut 32. The following tabulations, therefore, repair this omission. They illustrate the poem's metrical characteristics.

The poetic structure of Deut 32 may be divided into six sections with a total of fifteen strophes⁽³¹⁾.

Poetic and Metrical Structure of Deut 32

Prologue	strophe 1	(vv. 1-3)	tetrastich	all long colons
Accusation	strophe 2	(vv. 4-6)	pentastich	all long colons
Story of Benefits	strophe 3	(vv. 7-9)	pentastich	all long colons
	strophe 4	(vv. 10-12)	pentastich	9 long + 1 short colons
	strophe 5	(vv. 13-14)	pentastich	all long colons ⁽³²⁾
History of Sin	strophe 6	(vv. 15-18)	hexastich	10 long + 2 short colons
Judgement	strophe 7	(vv. 19-21)	pentastich	all long colons
	strophe 8	(vv. 22-24)	pentastich	9 long + 1 short colons
	strophe 9	(vv. 25-27)	pentastich	8 long + 2 short colons
	strophe 10	(vv. 28-31)	pentastich	7 long + 3 short colons
	strophe 11	(vv. 32-35)	hexastich	10 long + 2 short colons
	strophe 12	(v. 36)	distich	all long colons
	strophe 13	(vv. 37-39)	pentastich	9 long + 1 short colons
	strophe 14	(vv. 40-42)	pentastich	9 long + 1 short colons
Epilogue	strophe 15	(v. 43)	tetrastich	all long colons ⁽³³⁾

⁽²⁹⁾ CROSS, *Canaanite Myth*, 121-123.

⁽³⁰⁾ CROSS, *Canaanite Myth*, 123-124.

⁽³¹⁾ NIGOSIAN, "The Song", 7-13.

⁽³²⁾ The LXX, Sam, and 4QDeut supply this extra colon.

⁽³³⁾ The textual difficulty in this verse is so severe that it cannot be constructed with certainty. The LXX has eight colons, 4QDeut has

These fifteen strophes consist of alternating distichs, tetrastichs, pentastichs and hexastichs. Furthermore, there seems to be an overall artistic pattern. The opening and closing strophes are in tetrastichs while the remaining strophes consist mainly of pentastichs. On the whole, the strophes consist mainly of long cola with a few short cola interspersed here and there.

The overall prosodic pattern of Deut 32 is strikingly different from that of Exod 15. The strophes in Exod 15 are marked off by the change of meter from short to long, whereas in Deut 32 there are no such characteristics⁽³⁴⁾. The prosodic characteristic of Exod 15 is predominantly short, with long at the end of each strophe; but such is not the case in Deut 32. On the contrary, the prosodic characteristic in Deut 32 is predominantly long, with short dispersed in a few places. There are no tetrastichs, pentastichs or hexastichs in Exod 15; in Deut 32 there are.

If Cross is justified in assigning an early date to Exod 15 on the basis of a mixed metrical pattern, then Deut 32 cannot be attributed to the same early period because it does not conform to the Ugaritic prosodic pattern. The presence of long colons interspersed with short colons in Deut 32 can be explained by the survival of older forms characteristic of early patterns. Once again, the most logical date to assign to Deut 32 is the transitional period — the period between the 10th and 8th centuries BCE.

IV. Terminology

One of the important devices for dating a literary document in the Hebrew Bible is the comparative analysis of certain terms and expressions that indicate linguistic affinities with related words or phrases⁽³⁵⁾. The principles employed by this method are generally based on two procedures: lexical comparison and linguistic affinity.

six colons, and the MT has four colons. Although the correctness of any of the three versions cannot be demonstrated, I have followed the LXX rendering so that the epilogue (v.43) corresponds to the prologue (vv.1-3), consisting of one strophe in tetrastich.

⁽³⁴⁾ CROSS, *Canaanite Myth*, 126-131.

⁽³⁵⁾ For studies that employ this method for Deut 32, see S. R. DRIVER, *Deuteronomy* (ICC; Edinburgh 1895) 344-381; J. R. BOSTON, "The Song of Moses", (unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Union Theological Seminary 1966) 223-226; id., "The Wisdom Influence upon the Song of

Lexical Comparison

Rare or uncommon words, or terms, are explained by comparative lexical criteria which give an indication of the date of origin of a particular document. For instance, if certain words or terms in a document are recognized as archaisms or derivatives from related Akkadian or Ugaritic cognates, then the implication is that the document in question may date from an "early" period. If, however, certain words or terms are explained as archaisms or derivatives from related Assyrian, Persian or Aramean cognates, then the implication is that the document in question is of a "late" date⁽³⁶⁾.

Linguistic Affinity

Words, phrases or expressions are explained by a comparable linguistic affinity with other material the date of which is more or less established. Thus, if certain terms or phrases in a document are shown to be very similar to words or expressions in Exod 15, Num 23-24, or Judg 5, for instance, then the implication is that the document is of "early" date⁽³⁷⁾. If, however, certain phrases or

Moses", *JBL* 87 (1968) 198-202; M. DAHOOD-T. PENAR, "Ugaritic-Hebrew Parallel Pairs", *Ras Shamra Parallels*, vol. I (*RSP* I) (ed. L. R. FISHER) (Rome 1972) 71-88. Dahood, however, unlike the other two, does not accumulate linguistic data in order to determine the date of Deut 32.

⁽³⁶⁾ Recently, there has been a fruitful debate about dating biblical passages by this method; see, for instance, RENDSBURG, *Linguistic Evidence*, 12, 42, 64-65, 75-77, 99-100; YOUNG, *Diversity*, 30, 54, 59-63, 86-93, etc. However, the assumption that the occurrences of certain words or expressions suggest the age ("early" or "late" date) or geographical provenance ("Judean" or "Northern" dialect) may still be used with discretion.

⁽³⁷⁾ These biblical passages are generally accepted as "early"; see FREEDMAN, "Archaic Forms", 101-107; CROSS, *Canaanite Myth*, 115-116, 121-123; F. C. FENSHAM, *Exodus* (PrOT; Nijkerk 1984) 75-89; C. KLOOS, *Yhwh's Combat with the Sea: A Canaanite Tradition in the Religion of Ancient Israel* (Amsterdam-Leiden 1986) 130-135; L. E. STAGER, "Archaeology, Ecology, and Social History: Background Themes to the Song of Deborah", *Congress Volume Jerusalem 1986* (ed. J. A. EMERTON) (VTS 40; Leiden 1988) 221-234; J. C. DE MOOR, "The Twelve Tribes in the Song of Deborah", *VT* 43 (1993) 483-494; B. LINDARS, *Judges 1-5* (Edinburgh 1995) 213-215. For scholars rejecting the early date, see: for Exod 15, M. L. BRENNER, *The Song of the Sea Ex 15:1-21* (BZAW 195; Berlin 1991), who favours a post-exilic date; for Judg 5; YOUNG, *Diversity*, 32, 122-129, 164-166, who suggests that it may reflect the northern dialect and not necessarily a late composition.

words are shown to be very similar to terms found in Deutero-Isaiah, Chronicles, Ezra or Nehemiah, then the implication is that the document is of a "late" date⁽³⁸⁾.

The method proposed for trial is to list all those terms in the poem which also occur in certain passages of biblical literature which by general consensus are identified with either an early or a late period. In other words, the criterion for this method is its location, not the frequency with which a term appears in biblical literature. The reason is not hard to justify. In this sort of analysis the frequency of a term is not as important as its location in biblical material. For instance, one term in the poem may occur three times in other parts of biblical literature, while another term may recur thirty times. In what way does the frequency of either one of these two terms help to determine the date of the poem? The answer is obvious. The critical factor is the location in which any one term recurs.

If the term that recurs three times is located, for example, in Judg 5, Isa 10, and Isa 40, then one may conclude that, in spite of its frequent occurrence in biblical material, it nevertheless indicates its association with the early period (Judg 5), during the 8th century BCE (Isa 10) and with post-exilic times (Isa 40). Hence, while the frequency of this term is not high, location indicates that it was in use throughout the entire biblical period.

If, on the other hand, a term recurs thirty times, twenty instances of which are found in Isa 44 and ten instances in 1 Chr, then one may conclude that, despite its frequency, the term is not common to the entire biblical period but restricted to post-exilic times. It requires no great leap of the imagination to deduce that the location of a term is more significant than its frequency for determining the date of the poem.

In order to exploit this assumption, the following guidelines are adopted as a basis for analysis:

(1) Terms that are associated with an early period are restricted to terms that occur either in Ugaritic or only in the following

⁽³⁸⁾ These biblical books are generally considered as "late"; see R. L. BRAUN, *Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah: Theology and Literary History* (VTS 30; Leiden 1979) 52-64; P. ACKROYD, *Israel under Babylon and Persia* (London 1970); D. J. A. CLINES, *Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther* (NCBC 17; Grand Rapids 1984).

biblical material: Gen 49; Exod 15; Num 23–24; Judg 5; 2 Sam 22 = Ps 18⁽³⁹⁾.

(2) Terms that are associated with a late period are restricted to terms that occur only in the prophetic literature of the 8th century BCE and thereafter.

(3) Terms that recur in Psalms and/or Wisdom literature are excluded, since the dating of many of them is questionable.

(4) Terms that occur commonly in both early and late biblical material (i.e., commonly used throughout the biblical period) are irrelevant to this study and are not listed.

(5) No prose material is considered; only poetry.

These then are the guidelines which, when they are applied to the total 457 words of the poem, classify the words as follows:

- three words occur in early biblical/Ugaritic material;
- five words occur in late biblical material;
- eight words occur in Psalm/Wisdom material;
- thirteen words are *hapax*;
- 428 words occur commonly throughout biblical material.

Since the guidelines for this study exclude terms that occur commonly in both early and late biblical material, as well as terms that recur in Psalm/Wisdom material the 428 terms that are current throughout biblical material and the eight terms that appear only in Psalm/Wisdom literature are no help in dating the Song. The thirteen *hapax* terms are also excluded because they cannot be compared with any datable material. The remaining evidence for dating the poem consists of three early (vv. 2[2x].17) and five late (vv. 16.22[2x].24[2x]) terms. These may tabulated as follows:

⁽³⁹⁾ These biblical passages are considered by general consensus as early (see n. 37 above).

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Assuming the emendation proposed by W.L. MORAN, “Some Remarks on the Song of Moses”, *Bib* 43 (1962) 317-327.

<i>Term in Deut 32</i>	<i>Datable Reference</i>
v. 2 יערף	Deut 33,28
v. 2 כשעירם	I Aqt 44-46
v. 16 בורים	Jer 2,25; 3,13; Isa 43,12 (also in Ps 44,21; 81,10)
v. 17 חדשים	Judg 5,8
v. 22 קדחה	Isa 58,11; 64,1 (also in Jer 15,14; 17,4)
v. 22 תלהט	Isa 42,25; Joel 1,19; 2,3 (also Mal 3,19)
v. 24 קטב	Hos 13,14; Isa 28,2 (also in Ps 91,6)
v. 24 חולי	Mic 7,17

In addition to these terms there are three phrases (vv. 13.25. 39) that also fall within the categories defined by the guidelines. These phrases occur in late biblical material.

<i>Phrase in Deut 32</i>	<i>Datable Reference</i>
v. 13 ⁽⁴⁰⁾ על במותי ארץ	Amos 4,13; Isa 58,14
v. 25 בחור בתולה	Jer 51,22 (also in Ezek 9,6; 2 Chr 36,17)
v. 39 אבי הוא	Isa 41,4; 43,13.18, 46,4; 48,12

The relevant data represent three early terms, five late terms, and three late phrases. How is this evidence to be interpreted? The preponderance of terms and phrases associated with a late period challenges the credibility of an early date for the poem. On the other hand, three instances of early terms are difficult to explain conclusively. One explanation may be to consider the author's conscious awareness of three terms that were in early use; but such speculation cannot establish whether the author influenced later writers or was influenced by them, or even whether he was contemporary with later authors.

There is one more recourse — namely, Dahood's classification of "parallel pairs" that are part of the overall linguistic pattern discussed in this section⁽⁴¹⁾. His classification of entries for Deut 32

(41) M. DAHOOD-T. PENAR, "Ugaritic-Hebrew Parallel Pairs", *RSP I*, 71-383; M. DAHOOD, "Ugaritic-Hebrew Parallel Pairs", *RSP III*, 1-206. Dahood's study deals with "parallel pairs", a term that he uses in preference to the more common term "fixed pair", to describe those vocabulary units (one or two words in each unit) which may be used either in one colon or in the respective clauses of a bicolon. He indicates that one of the frequent features of Ugaritic poetry is the repetition of the same word in parallel cola, always occurring together in the same sequence. In Hebrew poetry, however, the order of synonyms is often reversed. To be

results in twenty-five parallel pairs (vv. 1.2[3x].4.6[3x].7[2x].10.13.14[4x].18.22.27.30.30-31.32.33.41.42)⁽⁴²⁾. These twenty-five parallel pairs may be grouped under two categories: nineteen fixed pairs occur commonly in Ugaritic and biblical material; six fixed pairs occur in Ugaritic material.

The nineteen parallel pairs cannot be used as evidence for dating the poem. The remaining six fixed pairs are tabulated as follows:

Parallel Pairs in Early Material

Parallel Pairs in Deut 32	Ugaritic Occurrence in RSP I
v. 4. 18 šwr...ʾl	gr + il II 448
v. 6 ʾb // kwn	ab // kn II 3
v. 6 qnh // kwnn	qny // knn II 493
v. 7 ymwt // šnwt	ymt // šnt II 241
v. 13 ʾrš // šwr	arš // grm II 69
v. 33 tnyn // ptn	tnn // btn II 592

These six parallel pairs are significant because they are not commonly used in biblical literature and because they are related to Ugaritic, factors which according to the guidelines of this study, are accepted as evidence for early dating.

Thus, there is a total of nine instances of early features (three terms and six parallel pairs) and eight instances of late features (five terms and three phrases). On the one hand, the evidence of late characteristics rules out the possibility of an early date for the poem. On the other hand, the evidence of early features is not so few that they may be considered simply as vestigial instances. These mixtures of both early and late patterns may suggest the period of transition from early to late poetic Hebrew — the period between the 10th and 8th centuries BCE.

sure, there are instances of Hebrew poetry that resemble the pattern of Ugaritic parallel pairs but they are limited to a score of cases. Dahood proceeds next to catalogue 680 parallel words. However, no attempt is made by Dahood to interpret the significance of these parallel pairs except to stress the unlimited possibilities for assessing Hebrew poetry and prose by the application of this technique.

⁽⁴²⁾ The listing of these twenty-five parallel pairs has been collected by me.

V. Assessment of Overall Linguistic Patterns

The preceding pages analyzed the linguistic characteristics of the poem in Deut 32. Four different principles were applied in order to determine if any of the linguistic data provide a clue for dating it and the result of each method was recorded separately at the end of each section. The following table summarizes these results to reveal the overall linguistic pattern of the Song.

The Philological Characteristics of the Song

<i>Linguistic Feature</i>	<i>Early</i>	<i>Late</i>
Syntax and Morphology		
Verbal conjugations	17 pref conj	9 w-pref conj
Position of w-pref.	5 medial	4 initial
y/w root	1 preserved	3 lost
the element <i>d</i> (<i>z</i>)		1 'šr
3ms pronom. suff.	3 - <i>ar:hū</i>	
3mpl pronom. suff.	4 - <i>mw</i>	26 - <i>hm/-m</i>
-y morpheme	1 -y	
Parallelism and Assonance	5 parallelisms	6 assonances
Metrical Structure	not early	possibly transitional
Terminology		
Terms	3 terms	5 terms
Phrases		3 phrases
Parallel pairs	6 pairs	

This philological inquiry has proved to be a most fundamental and helpful tool for determining with good probability a reasonably short span of time within which to date the poem. The linguistic characteristics of the poem are sufficiently explicit to indicate a mixture of both early and late features. The numerous instances of late features exclude the possibility of an early dating of the poem. Similarly, the number of early features compromises speculation about the archaizing of the poem. Archaizing could not be ruled out with apodictic certainty, but it repeatedly appeared to be an improbable alternative to the hypothesis of composition during the transitional period in poetic Hebrew. Thus, the only period that explains the significant presence of both early and late forms is the period of transition, the period between the 10th and the 8th

centuries BCE. Only such a period could account for the frequent occurrence of older forms characteristic of younger forms which eventually become characteristic of late or standard Hebrew.

University of Toronto
Victoria College
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1K7
Canada

Solomon A. NIGOSIAN

SUMMARY

The writer considers the philological characteristics of the poem in Deut 32 in order to determine if any of the linguistic data provide a clue for dating it. The examination of these characteristics involves the analysis of the following four elements: (1) syntax and morphology; (2) parallelism and assonance; (3) metrical structure and (4) terminology. This philological inquiry indicates a mixture of early and late linguistic features in Deut 32 and leads the author to place its composition during the transitional period in poetic Hebrew between the 10th and the 8th centuries BCE.

The Conception of Jesus (Luke 1,35)

This essay is concerned with eleven points, all of which either have to do directly with, or are in anticipation of Luke 1,35. The reason for citing and discussing these eleven points is that I believe that, taken together, they yield a better understanding of the title given to Jesus by the angel: Son of God (Luke 1,35)⁽¹⁾.

The Messiah

The first major revelation from the angel Gabriel to Mary surely describes to her a son who will be Messiah of Israel. Within the Jewish tradition and expectations, that Jesus should be called great and son of the Most High, and that he should be given the throne of David his father and that he should rule over Jacob — these are terms which reveal to Mary, to the reader, that the Jesus of Luke's coming story should be recognized to be Messiah. What is further noteworthy in the angel's message is his explicitly and somewhat repetitiously emphasizing that Jesus's rule is "*eis tous aiōnas*", that "of his kingdom there will be no end". While it is true that characteristics of the Messiah were quite varied in the time of Jesus, still it would be rare to find among them the notion that the Messiah's rule would know no end. Certainly, within the Christian eschatology, Paul offers, many years before Luke writes, an image in which, after death is subjected to the Messiah, all, including the son, is handed over [to the Father], that God might be all in all (1 Cor 15,25-28); the Messiah ceases to rule his kingdom, and God indeed is all in all. The Book of Revelation speaks of a time in which the faithful will "reign with Christ for a thousand years" (Rev 20,4); thereafter, there will be 'a combination' throne of God and of the Lamb in the new Jerusalem (Rev 22,1.3), and the faithful will also reign forever (*eis tous aiōnas tôn aiōnōn* Rev 22,5)

⁽¹⁾ Words such as "nature", "being", "person" have acquired over centuries particularized, scientific meaning in theological and doctrinal expressions. I do not use such words here in the sense of these later meanings.

— a kingdom, then, where God is now mentioned first and then the Lamb, with the faithful in attendance, each of the others in its proper order or relationship to God. In comparison with these Christian images, Gabriel's expressions regarding the unending character of the Messiah's rule help form a conception of Messiah⁽²⁾ which needs clarification: how is it that this Christ rules forever⁽³⁾?

How will THIS be?

Mary's response is a question: *pôs estai touto*? At first, one might think that the pronoun *touto* refers to *sullêmpsê en tê gastri*, to question how this conception might take place in one who knows not man. But it is clear from the many uses of *touto* in Luke's writings⁽⁴⁾ that the pronoun can equally refer to all that the angel

(2) Cf. J. NOLLAND, *Luke 1-9:20* (WBC 35a; Dallas 1989) 52; here Nolland shows how the various elements used in the angel's description of the Messiah can be found in the Old Testament, but it is, of course, the point that nowhere in the Old Testament (nor outside the Old Testament) are the elements formed together, especially around one person, with such emphasis on the unending rule of the Messiah. R. BROWN, *The Birth of the Messiah* (New York 21993) 310 notes that "Gabriel's words... constitute a free interpretation of II Sam 7:8-16". He underlines "the throne of his kingdom forever" (2 Sam 7,13) and "...house... kingdom forever" (2 Sam 7,16). These terms regarding "forever" are, in the LXX (presumed source of Luke): *heôs eis ton aiôna* (v. 13) and *heôs aiôna, eis ton eiôna* (v. 16). One can see the disparity between these phrasings and that of the angel: *eis tous aiônas, ouk estai telos* (v. 33).

(3) Cf. J. ERNST, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Regensburg 1977) 70: "Nimmt man hinzu, dass 'gross' im absoluten Sinne im AT nur Gott genannt wird... und dass der in der israelitischen Königs- und Messiasterminologie gebräuchliche Titel 'Sohn Gottes' durch den feierlichen Namen 'Sohn des Allerhöchsten' ersetzt wird, so kann nicht ausgeschlossen werden dass hier dem Messias-Jesus eine einzigartige, alle Vorbilder überbietende Gottesnähe zugesprochen wird".

(4) There are a number of examples in Luke-Acts where *touto* must refer to a complex antecedent and not just to one part of the antecedent. Cf., e.g., Luke 18,36: "Hearing a crowd going by, he asked what this might be". Luke 22,19: "And taking the bread and having blessed (it) he broke it and gave (it) to them saying: This is my body given for you; do *this* in memory of me". Luke 24,40: "And having said this, he showed them his hands and his feet". Acts 2,12,14: "Let this be known to you..." Cf. too Acts 10,16 + 11,10; 16,18; 19,10; 19,17; 23,7; 24,14; 26,16; 27,34.

has announced⁽⁵⁾. Thus, Mary is not asking only how can the conception happen, but how can all this happen if the conception is impeded. Historical or not⁽⁶⁾, her question seeks a further elucidation about the Messiah⁽⁷⁾, not only in regard to conception, but also in regard to the realization of all the angel has described⁽⁸⁾.

The Coming of the Spirit

The angel replies to Mary's question by noting first that "the Holy Spirit will come upon" her.

I believe it significant that Luke does not allow baptism-event language here. At 3,22, Luke notes that the Holy Spirit "descended upon" Jesus (Mark 1,10: "descended into"; Matt 3,16: "came upon"); perhaps Luke refused the possible and less subtle expression of Mark that "the Holy Spirit, like a dove, entered into Jesus". In any event, the use of *eperchomai... epi* at Luke 1,35 suggests a coming of the Spirit which goes far beyond anything expressed by *katabainô... epi* at 3,22⁽⁹⁾.

(5) I believe I am supported by J. FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX* (AB 28; Garden City, New York 1981) 348: "Mary's perplexity is only increased by the substance of the angel's message in vv. 32-33".

(6) Cf. FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 337: "Bultmann (HST, 295) maintains that 'Mary's question in v. 34 is absurd for a bride'; it is not absurd for one who was only engaged and had not yet come to live with her husband".

(7) Interesting are the following remarks: M.-J. LAGRANGE, *Évangile selon Saint Luc* (Paris 1948) 30: "La révélation va par degrés. Dire que l'enfant sera nommé fils du très-Haut, ce n'est pas pénétrer encore dans le mystère de sa nature divine. Cependant c'est plus que *esê hōs huios Hypsistou...*" and FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 206: "What should be noted here is that the full title [Son of God] is never found in the OT predicated directly of a future, expected Messiah. Pace Conzelmann (*Outline*, 76), the title is not 'synonymous with «Messiah»', even when used of a king".

(8) I. H. MARSHALL, *The Gospel of Luke* (Exeter 1978) 63, notes: "...it has been argued that the christology in vs. 34f. differs from that in vs. 31-33... it is questionable whether there is a christological difference between vs. 31-33 and 34f..."; since, however, he later notes, 71: "The description [1,35] culminates in the phrase *huios theou*, here undoubtedly in its full sense of one begotten by God", one should conclude that the earlier verses 31-33 also meant to speak, and do speak, of "one begotten by God" — which might be true, but only provided that one interprets vv. 31-33 in the more profound and advanced light of 1,35.

(9) MARSHALL, *Gospel*, 76 notes that "the concept [drawn from 1,35] fits in with the filial consciousness of the historical Jesus and with his

I also believe it significant that another language, that of Acts 2,33, is not used here. At Acts 2,33, God “gives the Spirit” to Jesus; that Jesus be said to be given the Spirit at 1,35 would not suggest at all the contribution by the Spirit that Luke signals here.

It certainly is significant, in the comparison-contrast established by the preceding description of John who is, like Jesus, about to be conceived, that Jesus always exceeds John⁽¹⁰⁾. In the matter of the Spirit, John is said (Luke 1,15) to be one who will be filled with the Spirit from his mother’s womb. John proves the reality of this momentous gift when, indeed from the womb, he recognizes the identity of Mary (Luke 1,41.44). How will Jesus, who exceeds John in every way, exceed him in this matter of the Holy Spirit?

The above considerations help further secure the exegetical suggestions of the past, that the Spirit here in 1,35 is the creative Spirit. That is, this is the Spirit whose coming will give life, will give existence, will make live that which no one else can make live⁽¹¹⁾. Thus, the Spirit is not an intrusion into an already existing Jesus of Nazareth, as at the Baptism, nor is the Spirit a gift from the moment Jesus is conceived. The Spirit will make be what otherwise could not be. However, as with the Baptism and the Spirit’s presence with John, there is emphasis on effect. Jesus’s whole life changed by virtue of the effect of the Spirit at his baptism, an effect which lasted throughout his life. John, too, recognized Mary, a clear effect of the presence of the Spirit upon the knowledge of John. Thus at 1,35, the angel suggests an effect of the Spirit which is in the line of creativity, the effect being the procreation of a human being⁽¹²⁾.

consciousness of the presence of the Spirit”; thus, Jesus’s consciousness of the presence of the Spirit is not due to his experience at baptism, but to something much more profound. This point is worth recalling throughout this essay.

(10) Cf. FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 237: “If the conception of John required a miracle, the step-parallelism requires an even greater one in Jesus’s conception. Hence the conception by a virgin”. This statement does not mean to suggest that the only reason for the affirmation that Jesus was conceived by a virgin was the need for step-parallelism.

(11) Cf. FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 351: “Luke’s sole concern is to assert that the origin of God’s Messiah is the effect of his creative Spirit on Mary”.

(12) Cf. NOLLAND, *Luke 1-9:20*, 55: “The *dio kai*, ‘therefore’, spans more than one logical step, and the text does not allow us to give it a precisely determined sense. The use of *klēthēsētai* (‘will be called’: cf. at

The Overshadowing by the Power of the Most High

“The Power of the Most High” that “will overshadow” Mary is well described by, among others, S. Lyonnet⁽¹³⁾. The Old Testament language of God’s dwelling in the place made holy by His dwelling there is the language which best explains the image given here to Mary⁽¹⁴⁾. The womb of Mary will be the dwelling place of God. It is an appeal to symbolism, in a story concerned with physical generation, for we know that the outcome of the angel’s meeting with Mary will be the birth of what is undoubtedly a human being, Jesus of Nazareth⁽¹⁵⁾.

v. 32) suggests a reading of *dio kai* along the lines ‘from what God here begins will flow consequences leading to...’ rather than as the ‘therefore’ of a strictly logical inference. Probably the child is thought of as being ‘holy’ and ‘Son of God’ from birth, with recognition to come later, but the text does not clearly specify”. While I appreciate Nolland’s precision about the meaning here of *dio kai*, I cannot support his reading the text in such wise that the effects of God’s action (“holy” and “Son of God”) in Mary will only occur at birth [or even later].

(13) S. LYONNET, “Le récit de l’Annonciation et la Maternité Divine de la Sainte Vierge”, *L’Ami du Clergé* 66 (1956) 33-46; cf. 44 for a fine explanation for our text of the word *episkiadzein* against the background of the Old Testament; the following remarks are pertinent: 45 “... Puisque son sein allait devenir le Tabernacle de Dieu même, l’unique endroit de la terre où Dieu allait demeurer..”. Cf. 44-45 “voici que l’ange Gabriel déclare à Marie qu’elle va se réaliser et comme s’actualiser en son sein, transformant ce sein virginal en un sanctuaire, un Saint des Saints vivant, ...”.

(14) Cf. R. BROWN, *Birth*, 290: “... knowing the rules of parallelism in biblical poetry which make it clear that ‘power from the Most High’ is synonymous with ‘Holy Spirit’...”.

(15) Cf. MARSHALL, *Gospel*, 73: “...in its present form the action of God in the story is not that of working through a natural process but is a new, creative act of a supernatural character... In any case, Luke’s language remains that of the Old Testament”; but, in order to avoid misunderstanding, one must insist upon what is “natural” about the process, if only because there is a “natural” womb involved here and there is a “natural” human being who will be the product of God’s action and will proceed to birth from this “natural” womb. Certainly the language is not sexual, to show that God’s action is not that of intercourse, but that language is not imposed so as to create the impression that no natural process is in view here.

Effective Power

The “dwelling of God by virtue of overshadowing cloud” surely connotes presence. But 1,35 indicates that what Luke wants here is not just presence, but power, power to effect something. He has created a parallelism in the angel’s speech: the Spirit will come upon you, the Power of the Most High will overshadow you⁽¹⁶⁾. This parallelism suggests a double manner of expressing cause, not just presence. It is the combination of the two, penetrating Spirit and overshadowing Power, a type of *hendiadys*, that expresses what Luke has understood to be happening here⁽¹⁷⁾.

Power and Spirit, however, are engaged in a precise activity. Under the influence of Mary’s question, the angel intends to say that they create, effect, but more exactly they are fecundating and procreating a human being. Why speak in what amounts to physical terms? Because the prior language of the angel and of Mary suggests this, and only this. A son is to be conceived in Mary’s womb; how this can be is mysterious, precisely because Mary knows no intercourse, and was earlier described as a virgin. It seems most unlikely that Luke now proceeds, with no clear warning, to strike down the import of these prior words by an evasive appeal, by subtle symbolism, to something non-physical. Impossible though the conception seems to be, and mysterious though its intelligibility may be, there seems no denial of the fact that the author engages us in a matter of physical conception.

It is then the effect of Spirit and Power⁽¹⁸⁾ that a child is conceived in the womb of Mary. It is a physical conception by virtue of Spirit and Power⁽¹⁹⁾.

(16) Cf. LYONNET, “Le récit”, 43: “Or voici qu’on lui apprend que cet Esprit du Seigneur, Esprit-Saint, va venir sur elle. En quel sens? Le second membre de la phrase, parallèle au premier, selon l’usage sémitique, va le préciser”.

(17) Cf. LYONNET, “Le récit”, 43: “Dans ce contexte, la ‘puissance du Très-Haut’ ne peut être qu’une autre désignation de l’Esprit-Saint, c’est-à-dire finalement de Yahvé lui-même”.

(18) F. BOVON, *L’Évangile selon Saint Luc 1-9* (Genève 1991) 77: “L’Esprit et la puissance sont associés. [note 79: Cf. Lc 4,14; Ac 1,8; 6,8 et 10,38. L. LEGRAND, *Arrière-plan*, p.164-169] Employé sans l’article, *pneuma hagion* est la puissance créatrice de Dieu”.

(19) Cf. E. SCHWEIZER, *The Good News According to Luke* (tr. D. Green) (SPCK; London 1984) 31: “Luke 1:35 describes in language that

What is born holy ...

With 1,35b Luke draws an inference from the causality of Jesus's conception. For years there has been a discussion of where to place "*hagion*" in the flow of the sentence. While most agree that "...will be called holy (and) Son of God" is the most suitable reading, I read *hagion* immediately after *gennômenon*⁽²⁰⁾; there are two reasons for this. First, there has been a certain kind of literary balance of phrasing ever since the angel began his revelation to Mary. The last example of this balance is the parallelism, "the Holy Spirit will come upon you", "the Power of the Most High will overshadow you". Respecting that parallelism, I place *to gennômenon hagion* in parallelism with *klêthêsetai huios theou*.

By doing this I continue to keep separate literarily what the angel has kept separate: Spirit, on the one hand, and the Power of the Most High, on the other. But literary nicety is not the only value here. What will be generated holy is what will be (= will be called) Son of God; I see the positioning of the words as suggesting this logic. It is not enough to say that what will be born will be holy and Son of God. Yes, the Spirit creates the Son of God, but its creativity, in this formula, effects more accurately "holy Son of God". The Holy Spirit's act creates holiness. On the other hand, the Divine Presence, which is noted here as Power, will effect what must, and can only be, called divinity. Holiness, then, is the particular characteristic of the creating Spirit and characterizes, in the first instance, the divinity of that person who becomes Mary's Son by action of the Holy Spirit. The literary position of *hagion*, which I propose here, best elucidates what Spirit and divine Power effect in Mary.

attempts to characterise God's mystery by recalling the unique act of creation at the beginning of the world"; W. HENDRIKSEN, *The Gospel of Luke* (Edinburgh 1979) 88: "The overshadowing or covering of which Luke speaks here is not static but active... It is creative, productive. It causes Mary to conceive a child... the spirit of God creatively hovering over the waters at the time of creation (Gen 1:2)".

⁽²⁰⁾ For some discussion of this point, cf. M. COLERIDGE, *The Birth of the Lukan Narrative* (JSNTSS 88; Sheffield 1993) 67, n.2: "to understand it in that way [*hagion* with *gennômenon*] makes a verbal link between *pneuma hagion* and *to gennômenon hagion* which insists upon the most irregular and radical relationship between the Holy Spirit and Jesus".

Son of God

What is generated holy will be called Son of God. It has been suggested that the future indicated by "will be called" refers to Jesus's baptism, where God calls Jesus "My Son" ⁽²¹⁾. But there are a number of times in the Gospel and Acts where Jesus is called Son of God; there seems to be no reason for singling out the baptismal moment as that time in the future to which the angel refers. But this brings up a further matter. The whole identification of Jesus as Son of God is not in terms of his being recognized by others and thus called Son of God. "Called Son of God" means "will be Son of God" ⁽²²⁾. Naming is a way of expressing what a person is. Perhaps the classic interplay in Luke between name and person occurs in Acts 4. Here Peter and John are asked, "...in what name did you do this?" (4,7). Peter begins by rephrasing the question somewhat ambiguously: "are we asked in whom or what (*en tini*) was this man saved?" (4,9). Peter's response returns to the first phrasing: "In the name of Jesus (*en onomati*)... this man stands before you healed" (4,10), but he also notes in the same sentence that "in this (*en toutô*: person or name) that this man stands before you healed" (4,10). That the latter *en toutô* is a person is suggested by the next sentence, specifically by the subject (*houtos*) of the next sentence (4,11), which has to be a person; this subject could refer to the antecedent *Iesou Christou*, but, given the flow of the sentence, more likely refers to the *toutô* of *en toutô*. The point I wish to make, that name and person are interchangeable, is clearly made now with Peter's culminating remark: "Salvation is not in anyone else, nor is there another name... in which we are to be saved" (4,12). This reflects Peter's earlier explanation of the same miracle, when he said on the one hand that "faith in this name has made this man strong" and on the other hand that "faith through him" has given this man wholeness (4,16).

⁽²¹⁾ Cf. BROWN, *Birth*, 291: "will be called... tantamount to saying 'he will be'... [Brown disagrees with the opinion that says] for Luke the conception of the child does not bring the Son of God into being, but only enables us to call him 'Son of God' who already was Son of God".

⁽²²⁾ Perhaps a bit extreme: N. GELDENHUYS, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* (Michigan 1954) 80: "*klêthêsetai* is stronger than *estai*, and indicates that He not only is the Son of God but will also be called and acknowledged as such".

At Luke 1,35, then, the angel indicates by the words “he will be called Son of God” that Jesus will be Son of God. Thus, there is no future event, e.g., baptism, towards which the angel points. Rather, Jesus born will be Son of God and all future moments in which he is identified as such have, for the reader, their explanation here.

Dio kai ...

Why did the angel ‘feel constrained’ to add the *dio kai* clause (1,35b)⁽²³⁾? One might say that, though unnecessary to the central concern of the dialogue between Gabriel and Mary, it adds a profound dimension to the meaning of Jesus; and it is the meaning of Jesus that occupies Luke greatly, particularly in these propaedeutic chapters (1,5–4,13).

But a better answer involves turning back to part of the dialogue, to Mary’s question. I have said in point 2 above that Mary’s question asks about more than the “how” of conception. Her question asks how all of this which the angel has announced can be. To answer her fully the angel tells her not only the means of conception but the grounding for a clearer understanding of Jesus Messiah. While one might have traced Jesus’s public life to his baptismal event and the Spirit therein, it is now clearer that one must trace his messianic being to his conception. Strained may be effort to understand a coherent dual influence of the Spirit, at conception and “when he was about 30 years old” (Luke 3,23), but Luke is clear that what explains how Jesus can be all that is said of him is due, not to a later-life experience, but to what was effected by the Holy Spirit and the Power of the Most High⁽²⁴⁾.

⁽²³⁾ Cf. FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 351: “As in the other places, it [*dio*] expresses a causal connection between the virginal conception and Jesus’ divine sonship ...”.

⁽²⁴⁾ Cf. C.F. EVANS, *Saint Luke* (London 1990) 165: “the Son of God: ...Its origins, usages and meanings continue to be debated. Basic to the term on a Jewish background would be the force of the Hebrew idiom ‘son of’. This could convey both God’s choice for a specially close relationship with himself of one who was to do his will and reproduce his intentions, and also the response of obedience on the part of the one so chosen. In this sense it could be variously applied to angels (Gen. 6,2; Job 1,6), to the collectivity of Israel by virtue of its covenant relationship with Yahweh (Exod. 4,22-23; Deut. 8,5-6; Hos. 11,1), and, in accordance with the royal

Luke 1,35b, then, takes the reader to a most profound level, beyond that understanding usually expressed in ancient documents about the Messiah. That Luke intentionally separates Messiah and Son of God in the Sanhedric trial (22,67 and 70) and again in the earliest preaching of Paul (Acts 9,20 and 22) reflects his pattern in Luke 1,35b: the two titles are to be integrated, but the Son of God title gives the fullest meaning, definition to the Messiah title.

Thus, the inclusion of v.35b in the angel's answer to Mary is not a gracious, but extra revelation; it is the profound explanation of what it means that Jesus will rule as Messiah over Jacob forever.

Father, Conception, Virgin

What is accomplished by combining the three disparate elements as Spirit/Power of the Most High, conception and virginity? Some exegetes have held that the message of the angel need not be understood as involving a virginal conception. Presumably, this interpretation understands that what would be achieved through the "coming upon" of the Spirit and the overshadowing of the Power of the Most High could be achieved in the course of normal human procreation. One might say with L. Sabourin, "Ce serait toutefois une erreur de croire que le Christ ne pouvait être Dieu et homme que s'il était conçu miraculeusement" ⁽²⁵⁾. But is there anything lost in the meaning of Jesus if the reality be that Mary was not a virgin? That is, is there anything lost in the meaning of Jesus if Joseph be the natural father of Jesus?

Putting the matter differently, what is to be gained by insisting that God, in the manner expressed by the angel, is the actual, in some physical sense, father of Jesus ⁽²⁶⁾? Indeed, and I touched on

mythology adopted by Israel from the outside, to the Davidic king as an embodiment of that relationship and its permanence (II Sam. 7,11-16; Ps. 2,7, where appointment by adoption is expressed by 'beget', Ps. 89, esp. vv. 26-27; 1 Chron. 22,10). In the Wisdom literature it came to be applied to individual righteous Israelites (Ecclus 4,10; Wisd. 2,12-18; 5,5; cf. Luke 6,35)".

⁽²⁵⁾ L. SABOURIN, *La christologie à partir de textes clés* (Montreal 1986) 76.

⁽²⁶⁾ Cf. H. SCHÜRMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium* (Freiburg 1969) 40: "Das geschieht durch den Aufweis, wie Jesus ein menschliches Dasein der schöpferischen Tat Gottes im Schoos einer Jungfrau verdankt". God can

this point above, does it really matter that God's fatherhood take effect at Jesus's conception rather than at his baptism (or resurrection)? Why would it matter?

The three elements — fatherhood of God, conception of Jesus, virginity of Mary — conspire to give a meaning to Jesus which could not otherwise be achieved.

That Mary is a virgin at the conception of Jesus is a central affirmation of the annunciation scene. In a certain sense, it matters little how this virginity be evaluated from an historical point of view or to what it historically refers: a vow taken by Mary, or a desire of her and Joseph which runs short of vow, or the description of the brief period between the angel's announcement and Mary's marriage to Joseph. And to refer to Mary's virginity as a literary element of the story is no adequate solution; even if it were merely a literary addition, the author intends her, for the story's sake, to be virgin and should be able to make reasonable sense narratologically when asked the import of the literary element he has created⁽²⁷⁾. The comprehension of Jesus is tied to his conception⁽²⁸⁾. Mary, in whom

be said to have caused "ein menschliches Dasein", but in causing it, did He effect something divine?

(²⁷) Cf. NOLLAND, *Luke 1-9:20*, 53: "If v. 34 were purely Lukan, then the literary device suggestion would have much to commend it... However, the language of v. 34 favors on the whole a pre-Lukan existence, and more importantly vv. 32-33 require just such a transition as v. 34 to connect with v. 35, which... has a strong claim to original and pre-Lukan unity with vv. 32-33". Nolland's view makes it difficult to affirm that the traditional literary form of "annunciation" was Luke's creation. Strangely enough, Nolland (54) considers the mention-in-advance, that Mary was betrothed to Joseph (v. 27), to be secondary, an addition in the light of chapter 2; however, what the story seems to want is a very clear tension between Mary's virginity and her imminent marital state, a tension which serves the unique conception she will experience and would be lessened by not mentioning her imminent marriage — cf. S. DEL PÁRAMO, "Anunciación de la Virgen", *EstBib* 16 (1957) 161-185: "Lo único que dice [Lucas] es que se trata de una virgen, como era natural en su condición de desposada: esto basta", 172. For a history of the interpretation of v. 34, cf. S. MUÑOZ IGLESIAS, "La concepción virginal en Lc 1,26-38 hoy", *EphMar* 43 (2, 1993) 175-187.

(²⁸) FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 208 notes that "what we can trace, however, are the various stages or phases of awareness on the part of the NT writers as they gradually recognized the implications of that revelation [= Jesus as Son of God], when or however it took place". To trace stages of awareness

he is conceived, knows not man, and this lack of knowledge is an obstacle to conception and a confirmation that without a father Jesus cannot be conceived. This conception by Mary has been considered, from the beginning of this story, to be a physical conception; indeed, the “more-than-parallelism” involved with the preceding physical, but miraculous conception of John suggests in its own way a physical, but miraculous conception of Jesus. Thus, fatherhood must operate in the physical world and produce a physical child.

Whatever insight was gained about the meaning of Jesus from his resurrection or from his transfiguration or from his baptism — moments when Jesus is called “My Son” — is not equal to the radical insight gained about him from his creation by God at his conception.

When Paul, at Acts 13,33, interprets Jesus’s resurrection (*anastêsas*) by Psalm 2,7 (aided by Psalm 16,10), he is emphasizing God’s ability to make Jesus live (again): this ability to confer life is based on the analogy of the father who generates physical life. Thus God can be called father when He gives life to Jesus after death, but only by analogy; life after death is not the primary analogue of fatherhood.

That Jesus is son of God by virtue of what happens at his transfiguration or baptism is also to be understood against the primary analogue, physical conception of a human being. There is no procreation intended at either transfiguration or baptism. The sonship of Jesus can have a relationship to life on the score that God acts upon Jesus in such a way as to direct him to a new way of living and the creating gift of the Spirit which enables this new way of living to happen. This can be called “fathering”. More likely, this sonship consists particularly in establishing a relationship of particular obedience, as a son to a father, between Jesus and God. Here it is not a question of life-giving conception, but of a revelation of an already existing degree of union which is best described by the

does not mean that one knows the initial moment of awareness. And that Son of God is associated, e.g., with resurrection does not mean that the awareness of Jesus’s being Son of God came solely from that experience of resurrection. As Fitzmyer suggests regarding the realization of Jesus’s being Son of God, the realization came from the revelation, “when or however it took place”.

“father-son” relationship. In either case, the father-son relationship which intends to clarify the relationship between Jesus and God at these two junctures of Jesus’s adult life is nowhere as radical a statement of relationship as is that which claims God to be the generating cause of Jesus’s very being⁽²⁹⁾.

Virginity, then, and conception are elements which contribute to making the being of Jesus a radical effect of God⁽³⁰⁾. We should also note here the manner by which the ancient world explains generation. I realize the chanciness of this kind of consideration and I have no intention of claiming here that God is the physical generative principle of Jesus through intercourse with Mary. The leap from physical language of conception (virgin, you will conceive in your womb, you will bring forth, I know not man) to such a mysterious language of “coming upon” and “overshadowing”, non-sexual terms, rules out physical intercourse here. But the analogy with physical generation or pro-creation is everywhere in the story, and the analogical terms therefore must be considered for their possible contribution to the understanding of what Luke intends here.

While there were differing opinions about embryology in the ancient world, the time of Luke seems dominated by the affirmation of Aristotle; Galen, born in 131 AD, and his teaching appear too late to influence first-century thinking. In the Aristotelian understanding, the mother of the child is the receptacle of the seed of the father; the mother’s contribution is as material cause, the father’s contribution is active, formal cause. Indeed, the form of the child to be is conveyed by the father’s seed; the mother nurtures and brings to fruition what has been conveyed to her by the father⁽³¹⁾. This analysis so imperfect, opens up the possibility of

(29) Cf. ERNST, *Evangelium*, 75: “Der Autor will etwas über die besonderen Umstände der Lebensentstehung Jesu aussagen; es geht also zunächst um ein biologisches Phänomen, das allerdings in den grösseren Kontext des Christusbekenntnisses eingeordnet werden will”.

(30) Cf. ERNST, *Evangelium*, 80: “...in Gott Begründet... der wunderbaren Schöpferkraft Gottesverdankt...”.

(31) Cf. A. TOSATO, *Il matrimonio israelitico* (AnBib 100; Rome 1982) 164, n. 10: “Si ritiene dunque che sia lo stesso seme maschile a trasformarsi in embrione. Dell’ovulo femminile non si ha conoscenza (prima descrizione nel 1827 d.C., K.E. von Baer, *Epistula de ovi mammalium et hominis genesi*). La funzione della donna corrisponde a quella della terra...: essa

understanding the meaning and intention of Jesus's physical conception by the creativity of God in the womb of one whose role was that of material cause, who nurtured and brought to fruition what God had begun in her⁽³²⁾. Obviously, the mind is trying to grasp a mystery here, for God is not conveying seed to Mary; Gabriel's language shows this. But on the analogy of ordinary physical conception, God is given a role by which He defines, as in no other instance, the reality to be called Jesus. What is achieved by God's being the creative active and formal principle here?

Certainly, the relationship between God and Jesus is one which goes beyond anything created by relationships struck at other moments in their union, and it certainly goes far beyond the free union of their wills, a union which can serve to picture Jesus and God as Son and Father. This creative act of God does not produce obedience as its fruit; it produces a particular, unique nature to be nurtured by Mary.

The rough embryology of the time, which is the basis of the analogy in the angel's announcement, makes the father's seed the

fornisce al seme il recettacolo (la matrice) e il nutrimento (il sangue mestruo, all'uopo trattenuto); 165: "... la prole è sì il frutto dell'uomo e della donna; ma diversamente: del primo è 'discendenza' per antonomasia, lo stesso suo 'seme'; della seconda è piuttosto 'figliolanza', il 'seme' altrui, cui essa ha assicurato la sopravvivenza e la crescita", "... (l'uomo) ... è lui il principio, nel suo fisico è contenuto il passato e il futuro della umanità ...", 166, n. 15: "Il minor apprezzamento delle *figlie* rispetto ai *figli* va fatto risalire alla stessa costituzione fisica e alla fisiologia femminili: a differenza dei figli, le figlie non riproducono il seme paterno". 167, n. 18: "... il feto è qualcosa sostanzialmente del marito, non della moglie". 167: "... a differenza dell'uomo essa non è produttrice e posseditrice di un seme proprio".

⁽³²⁾ Cf. H. J. CADBURY, "The Ancient Physiological Notions Underlying John I. 13 and Hebrews XI. 11", *The Expositor* (Series IX 2, December 1924) 430-439: "According to one view among the Greek doctors and other writers the human being (like other animals) is made from *sperma* supplied by the father and blood supplied by the mother. The blood coagulates... and is the basis of the solid flesh. The evidence for the currency of this idea of conception was briefly stated by Grimm (*Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen*, 1906) in his note on the passage [Wisdom of Solomon VII. 1f.] with quotations from Philo, Aristotle and Pliny... The views of the ancients are expressed most fully in Aristotle (*De animalium generatione* and *Historia animalium*), and in Galen, *De semine* (in Kuhn, *Medicorum Graecorum Opera*, Vol. IV.)".

formal cause of the child. Even if the philosophical niceties are ignored, the basic idea remains: the father's seed determines in its own significant way major characteristics of the child.

Old Testament thought understood something of this when it described wisdom (e.g., judges), power (e.g., kings), holiness (e.g., priest) as qualities of "sons of God", as though these people be participations in the wisdom, power, holiness of God, as sons participate in a father⁽³³⁾. Indeed, the talents exhibited by the Temple artisans are participations in the qualities of God and so they merit being called "sons of God". To be called a son of God meant that one shared in and exhibited a characteristic⁽³⁴⁾ of God, and that this characteristic was, in an analogous way, conveyed to a human being as a father conveys qualities to a child he engenders⁽³⁵⁾. The Old Testament never thought of such a gifted human being as becoming, by the gift, divine, neither is there any indication in that literature that such characteristics were conveyed through a begetting in which there was no human father principle. But at least it can be said that the Old Testament offers some support to the perception that God shares His qualities⁽³⁶⁾; it is

(33) Cf. J. NOLLAND, *Luke 1-9:20*, 45-46: "In Jewish thought to be a son of God is never a matter of physical origin. The notion "son of God" is generally focused on *adoption or election* to a special relationship with God (Exod 4:22; 2 Sam 7:14; Pss 2:7; 89:26-27; Jer 31:20; Hos 11:1; Sir 36:11; 4 Ezra 6:58; Ps.-Philo *Bib. Ant.* 32.10; cf. TDNT 8:347-53). When the nation Israel is in view, sometimes the additional element of God's *formation* of the nation is also present (Isa 43:6-7; cf. 63:16; 64:8), and something analogous in the way of *endowment* is possibly present also in the case of the king (Ps 2:7). Even when used of supernatural beings the language of sonship expresses no more than that these beings *belong to the heavenly order* and not to the earthly (Gen 6:2.4; Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7...). Occasionally the element of *moral likeness* to God appears, though not generally alone (Ps 73:15[?]; Sir 4:10). [My underlinings here.] Luke's own use of sonship language in connection with Jesus stands squarely in continuity with that of the Jewish tradition".

(34) Cf. FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 338: "The Spirit's role would be one of endowing the child with a special character suiting him to bear the title Son of God".

(35) Cf. FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 340: "The result of it [the overshadowing and coming upon] will be that the child will not be merely a Davidic Messiah but God's own Son".

(36) For an excellent discussion of Son of God against the Old Testament and other Jewish writings, cf. M. HENGEL, *The Son of God* (tr. J. Bowden) (London 1976) 41-56.

Luke's contribution to note that God shares His qualities with Jesus as He effects his very being.

What is revealed by the angel here then is a process by which the very being of Jesus is identified as the effect of a father. The purpose of this revelation seems clear. It not only serves to explain the unique and extremely intimate relationship Jesus knew himself to be in *vis-à-vis* God, a relationship not known, because of its founding in the father's role at conception, to exist between any other human being and God. It also serves to explain the profound divine qualities which were perceived to ground what was known as Jesus of Nazareth. The gospels are replete with a variety of efforts to analyse and estimate the meaning of Jesus: Just who is he? The annunciation of Gabriel serves to propose, from the beginning, the most adequate explanation Luke knows of the being of Jesus; his essence, his existence is owed to the creative fatherhood of God which, analogously speaking, corresponds to the effect every father has upon the son he engenders⁽³⁷⁾. No other divine intrusion into the life of Jesus is as radical in its effect upon Jesus as is this creative causality.

Luke 1,35 as Overture to the Gospel

But when Luke tells this story of the annunciation, the reader must realize that the story is put in the overture to the Gospel⁽³⁸⁾. This means that the explanation of Jesus revealed by knowing God as His father is intended to have an effect on all the Gospel and Acts⁽³⁹⁾. Let us pause to consider for a moment the strategic purpose of this story.

I have already noted that the identification of Jesus as Holy and Son of God gives a profundity of meaning to "Son of the Most High", i.e., the Messiah, which otherwise remains

⁽³⁷⁾ Cf. L. PANIER, *La naissance du fils de Dieu* (Paris 1991) 186: "En Marie et Jésus, dans la corporéité charnelle que la conception manifeste en eux ...".

⁽³⁸⁾ I cannot understand the sense of the statement, "... Luke's Gospel is conceivable without them" [= circumstances of Jesus's birth]: EVANS, *Saint Luke*, 137.

⁽³⁹⁾ Cf. EVANS, *Saint Luke*, 142: "P. Minear [n.x: 'Luke's Use of the Birth Stories', in *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. Keck and Martyn, pp. 111-30] argues... that the birth narratives are homogeneous with the rest of L-A, and that Luke has made them... integral to his whole work".

unsuspected⁽⁴⁰⁾. And while Son of God has varied shades of meaning as one passes through the Gospel's overture (1,5-4,13) — Jesus in the Temple teaching because he is Son of God, Jesus identified by God Himself as "My" faithful suffering Son of God, Jesus rooted genealogically in God's Fatherhood. Jesus as Son of God overcoming temptations to infidelity to his Father — the Gospel story of Jesus's public life, death and resurrection depends for its proper interpretation on the reader's bringing forward at each and every moment his recollection that this is Jesus created by God in the virgin Mary. That Luke does not actively call the reader to this recollection might be thought to be a literary mistake on the author's part⁽⁴¹⁾. But that he intends to deny or forget the literary function of the overture as he develops his story is an assumption that needs firm proof; Luke knows the nature of the overture and can be trusted to intend its purpose to be fulfilled in his story-telling⁽⁴²⁾.

(40) F. BOVON, *L'Évangile*, 78: "Jésus sera donc appelé non seulement 'saint', mais encore, dans un sens différent que ne l'ont été Israël ou les anciens rois, 'Fils de Dieu'"; 72: "La proposition théologique du v.35 représente plutôt la *conclusion* d'un développement christologique e le *point de départ* du récit... Le v. 35 n'est donc pas une précision supplémentaire".

(41) For an attempt to resolve the role of the Spirit at Jesus's conception and at his Baptism, an attempt I find unsuccessful, cf. R. SCHNACKENBURG, *Die Person Jesu Christi im Spiegel der Vier Evangelien* (Freiburg 1993) 156: "Wenn die Geistbegabung mit der Taufe Jesu verbunden wird, erst von da an Jesus mit dem Geist erfüllt ist und den Teufel besiegt, entsteht eine Spannung zur Kindheitsgeschichte. Nach ihr kommt der Geist schon bei der Jungfrauengeburt auf Jesus herab, und die Kraft des Höchsten überschattet ihn (1,35). Die Zukunftsaussagen sind nicht auf die spätere Taufe zu beziehen; denn schon das aus Jesus (sic! Maria?) geborene Kind wird Sohn Gottes genannt werden. Ist die Geisterfüllung also schon bei der Empfängnis und Geburt Jesus gegeben, wie kann dann der Geist erst bei der Taufe auf Jesus herabkommen? Wie kann er schon aufgrund der geistgewirkten Geburt 'Sohn Gottes' genannt werden (1,35), während ihn erst die Himmelsstimme bei der Taufe als den geliebten Sohn Gottes proklamiert? Wie ist diese Spannung zu erklären? Der Grund dürfte in der Aufnahme verschiedener Traditionen liegen". But the question remains as to what Luke thought he was accomplishing by combining these "verschiedene Traditionen" so as to explain Jesus.

(42) Cf. F. HAHN, *Christologische Hoheitstitel* (Göttingen 1964) 318: "Einerseits hat er die Vorgeschichte aufgenommen und scheut sich nicht, messianische Prädikate auf das Kind Jesus anzuwenden; aber dies ist doch offensichtlich im proleptischen Sinn gemeint, wie er ja auch an der alten

Thus, not only at junctures in the Gospel story of the public life of Jesus when Son of God is mentioned are we keyed to recall the annunciation story, but also at points when such particular titles as Kyrios (e.g. 7,13) and Messiah (4,18 in conjunction with 3,22) are used should we think of their grounding in the reality that Jesus is radically and essentially, and so first of all, God's Son. It is the revelation at the annunciation that makes fullest sense of Jesus' self-description as the son who, alone, knows the Father and is known by Him (10,22). Jesus's mind-boggling control of the entire demon world, to the point of his being privy to watching, as cause, the falling of Satan, is explicable finally only in the realization of his being Son of God in the most radical way. Finally, the resurrection and glorification of Jesus "now" is owed to an intense relationship (suggested by words of Psalm 16 in Peter's Pentecost speech) that made it impossible that Jesus be raised only on the "last day" (John 11,24). While Jesus's resurrection and glorification clearly show him to be Israel's Messiah and Lord⁽⁴³⁾, it is the unique

Bedeutung von Lk 1,26ff. festgehalten hat, wonach Jesus Gottessohn ist auf Grund der die Empfängnis bewirkenden Lebensmacht des Geistes, und nicht an eine Gottessohnschaft im physischen Sinne denkt... Das *klêthêsetai huios theou* 1,35 bekommt damit einen im Gesamtrahmen sehr präzisen Sinn, indem es auf das Taufgeschehen verweist". I agree that the conception of Jesus prepares for the "Taufgeschehen", but also for the rest of Luke-Acts as well; moreover, one must take care to distinguish well the sense in which God does and does not bring about the physical conception of Jesus.

(⁴³) Cf. SCHÜRMANN, *Lukasevangelium*, 40: "So wird Jesu 'Messianität' und sein 'messianisches' Wirken — von dem die Evangelien-schrift des Lukas berichten will — gleich zu Begin stabil fundiert, and zwar auf einem Bekenntnis, auf einer christologischen Wesensaussage: Jesus ist der 'Heilige' Gottes, der aus einer Jungfrau geborene 'Sohn Gottes' und als solcher der 'Messias' (welche Reihenfolge für Luk nicht umkehrbar ist)". Cf. also FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 202: "The use of kyrios for Jesus would have meant putting him on the same level as Yahweh, without, however, identifying him, since he is never referred to as 'abba'"; 203: "In using kyrios of both Yahweh and Jesus in his writings Luke continues the sense of the title already being used in the early Christian community, which in some sense regarded Jesus as on a level with Yahweh. This is not yet to be regarded as an expression of his divinity, but it speaks at least of his otherness, his transcendent character". It is not clear to me how to distinguish adequately between "his divinity" and "his otherness, his transcendent character" (which, I should add, are effects of the creativity of God in the womb of Mary).

relationship between God and Jesus, Father and Son, that explains most thoroughly why the resurrection happened⁽⁴⁴⁾.

The entire Jesus story merits interpretation by the means Luke offered Theophilus so that he have *asphaleia* regarding what he had been taught; the overture of the Gospel should be allowed to have its proper literary, and therefore theological effect, and the reader should know Jesus to be, in every instance, the one mysteriously engendered by God on the analogy of Father in the virgin womb of Mary.

Jesus holy

At this point it is worthwhile to consider again that Jesus, because of this engendering, is called holy⁽⁴⁵⁾. Luke uses this word in Acts to denote those baptized who have received the Spirit (9,13.32.41; 26,10); their holiness is a characteristic effect of the Holy Spirit received in relation to their act of faith and to their baptism. The Temple, too, is called the holy place (Acts 21,28), because it shares in some sense the holiness of the God in some way (depending on one's theology) present there. To be called holy, then, is to be identified as one sharing in God's holiness.

Holiness itself is a difficult concept to define. Perhaps more than any other term in Jewish theology, holiness is the description which sets God apart as God, far apart from all other reality. It is because of His inestimable goodness and generosity that any other being can be called holy and indeed be holy.

Holiness is shared or given, not taken. To call Jesus holy is to suggest that he has been given holiness, shares in holiness⁽⁴⁶⁾. What

⁽⁴⁴⁾ Regarding the conception of Jesus and Pentecost, cf. H. RÄISÄNEN, *Die Mutter Jesu im Neuen Testament* (Helsinki 1969) 102: "Die Geburt Jesu aus dem Geist, die den Geistbesitz schon vor seiner Taufe begründet, weist voraus auf die Geistausgiessung zu Pfingsten, die ihrerseits die Gemeinde für ihren Auftrag ausrüstet".

⁽⁴⁵⁾ Cf. SCHÜRMANN, *Lukasevangelium*, 53-54: "Das eigentliche Erzählungsinteresse der ganzen Perikope lichtet sich nun: die 'Heiligkeit' — (und indirekt:) die 'Gottessohnschaft' — Jesu bis in die Ursprünge seines Wesens in Gott zu verankern... Gottes Pneuma wird ihm schöpferisch lebenspendend das Dasein geben, darum sein innerstes Wesen bestimmen und es 'heilig' machen".

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Cf. A. R. C. LEANEY, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke* (London 21966) 84: "I John II. 20 and Rev. III. 7 show further the

distinguishes him from other "holies" is that it is this holiness which is singled out as the first effect of God's engendering him. When one asks what it means to have God as the source of one's being, one finds that, according to Luke's account, it means that God makes Jesus holy by engendering him. Jesus has at the root of his being the holiness which is at best shared in a much lesser way with other creations. It is the most divine of characteristics which characterizes what is conceived in Mary.

Let us consider this matter from another angle. If Son of God were the effect of God's engendering, why was it not enough to announce that "the Power of the Most High will overshadow you"? To explain more completely what Mary should conceive, the Spirit of God, the Spirit of holiness is joined to the term "the Power of the Most High". It is not just a question of power which makes Jesus a divine son, it is a question of what stands in the very being of Jesus which makes him God-like, which explains him in a way that no other title known to Jewish or Gentile Christianity could explain him.

Sometimes reflection on this Lucan story turns to Mary who carries, like the Temple, the presence of God. But, unlike the Temple, Mary is not called holy; what she carries, however, is called first of all holy. And he is holy, not because of gift to his adult person, but because of the fact that he exists as effect of the Spirit of holiness.

To do justice to Luke's thought, then, one must respect the division or duality at 1,35 between holiness and Son of God and in a swift gesture bring the two of them into such a tight union that Jesus be forever known as the holy Son of God, because radically engendered by the Holy God, His Father.

Central to this discussion of Jesus as holy and Son of God is my original suggestion, that fatherhood, virginity and conception be considered *together* when the angel's words are being weighed. Certainly one can study each of these three elements separately, to gain a better understanding of each. But unless fatherhood of God be considered in the context of virginity and physical conception, one might be left with a Jesus not much different from that of the traditional Messianic king or the inspired prophet⁽⁴⁷⁾. And if one

connexion between the epithet 'holy' applied to the Lord and his divine origin".

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Cf. BROWN, *Birth*, 313: "However, whereas the declaration of Jesus as God's Son at the resurrection or enthronement in heaven or at the

does not pay due attention to the virginity of Mary, and so lack of human fatherhood for Jesus, one is not far from a miracle along the lines of the conception of John the Baptist. And if one does not take due cognizance that the angel here speaks of a physical conception, one might remain only in the area of symbolism without reaching to the profound physical reality intended here. In short, it is not just one of these three elements which is revealing about Jesus, but the three elements in their effects on one another that makes the message of the angel a revelation about Jesus that brings his very being into the mystery of the divine⁽⁴⁸⁾.

*

* *

Scholars are clear that Luke 1,5-4,13 serve as introduction to the central matter of the Gospel, the public life, death and resurrection of Jesus. The lessons of this introduction, in their own way meant to provide *asphaleia* to Theophilus, pervade the reading of the Gospel and Acts; it is the nature of an introduction or overture to influence the understanding of what follows it. A great concern of Luke's story is the identity of Jesus. In this regard, Luke 1,35 plays a central role⁽⁴⁹⁾. There it is made clear that the Jesus to be encountered is holy and Son of God in a most radical way⁽⁵⁰⁾. What is understood to be

baptism involved a figurative begetting... the association of the christological formula with the conception involves a more literal begetting”.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Cf. E. RICHARD, *Jesus: One and Many* (Delaware 1988) 186: “God’s plan is the center, and at the core of this plan is God’s agent, the perfect human instrument whom God calls ‘my Beloved Son’ (3:22), ‘my Son, my Chosen one’ (9:35). But most of all, for the author of Luke-Acts Jesus is ‘the Christ or Messiah of God’”. I cannot read Luke-Acts in this way.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ Cf. BROWN, *Birth*, 309: “...it seemed that the message about the future of JBap was consonant with and even derived from what Luke knew of JBap in the body of the gospel... Similarly, I shall argue here that Luke composed his description of the future accomplishments of Jesus upon the basis of Christian christological reflection”.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ One can appreciate the opinion of SCHNACKENBURG, *Person*, 174: “Ferner ist hervorzuheben: Jesus Christus, der Herr, bleibt trotz seiner göttlichen Würde, dem Herrn, untergeordnet... Gott bleibt der eigentliche Herr und Gott...”, but one is then all the more taxed to explain what God, on the analogy of father, effected in the womb of Mary. Cf. BROWN, *Birth*, 313 n.56: “Exactly what Luke means by ‘Son of God’ is not totally clear... I think Lyonnet, ‘L’Annonciation’, 66, is too narrow when he sees

produced in human physical conception is analogously said of Jesus. There is no doubt here: physical conception is intended. What is noteworthy is the shift to a language not associated with physical conception in order to do justice to the reality. The reality is more than Messiah, as the first words of the angel would have left it without Mary's question. The reality, which explains the foundations of this Messiah, is that her child will be holy and Son of God. The physical generation is due somehow to God. The first effect of this divine action is holiness, the quality above all others that separates and identifies God against all creation. The Power of God which produces this child can only effect a child who is Son of God⁽⁵¹⁾. With this revelation about the profound nature of Jesus Theophilus is in a position to understand the deepest truth that emerges in each of the stories Luke narrates. Others fumble for a correct perception of Jesus; with Luke 1,35 Theophilus, privileged reader, has that perception, and understands better, for having read Luke, the assuredness of the things he has been taught about Jesus of Nazareth, for he understands to a profound degree the divinity which characterizes the Messiah Jesus.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Roma

John J. KILGALLEN, S.J.

SUMMARY

The Christological affirmation in Luke 1,35 is to be understood by integrating together three elements of the Lucan text: the paternity of God (especially considering the physiology of the day), the virginity of Mary, the physical birth of Jesus. This profound Christology is meant to illuminate both the description of Jesus given in vv. 31-33 and the eventual person described in the rest of Luke-Acts.

only two choices: to take it in a broad sense as equivalent to messianic king or in a proper sense as equivalent to "God"... Luke is certainly using 'Son of God' in a proper sense in 1,35d, but he is not necessarily saying what Ignatius said twenty or thirty years later: 'Our God, Jesus Christ, was conceived of Mary' (Ephes. XVIII 2; VII 2)". But Brown is unable to say what Luke was 'necessarily' saying when he uses 'Son of God' of Jesus in a 'proper' sense, though sure that Lyonnet is 'too narrow'.

(⁵¹) Cf. LAGRANGE, *Évangile*, 36: "Pourquoi Dieu voudrait-il être le Père par une conception surnaturelle, de celui qui ne serait pas vraiment son Fils?"

ANIMADVERSIONES

La critique biblique à la lumière des Archives royales de Mari II: 1 S 18,21b

Dans notre étude précédente⁽¹⁾, nous avons démontré que le motif du javelot fait partie du récit original de Jos 8 et qu'il n'y est pas étranger, comme supposent la majorité des commentateurs, car il reflète la réalité de l'époque à laquelle a vécu l'auteur du récit.

Dans la présente étude, nous essayerons de démontrer que, grâce à une lettre de Mari, on peut trouver la bonne traduction d'un verset biblique et l'éclairer d'une nouvelle lumière. Dans le récit que Segal⁽²⁾ nomme «Saül est jaloux de David et cherche à se débarrasser de lui» 1 S 18,6-30, on trouve le verset suivant: *wy'mr š'wl 'l dwd bšty m ttħtn by hywm*, 1 S 18,21b. Voici les traductions françaises modernes que nous avons consultées:

La Bible de Jérusalem (BJ):

«Saül dit deux fois à David: 'Tu seras aujourd'hui mon gendre'»;

La Bible de la Pléiade:

«Saül dit donc à David une seconde fois: 'Tu deviendras mon gendre aujourd'hui'»;

La traduction œcuménique de la Bible (TOB):

«Saül a donc dit à David en deux fois: 'Tu sera mon gendre aujourd'hui'»;

La Bible de Chouraqui:

«Shaoul dit à David: 'À deux conditions tu seras mon gendre, ce jour'»;

La Bible de Cahen:

«Schaoul dit à David: 'Tu seras mon gendre par (l'un des) deux'».

Examinons d'abord le récit lui-même. Une comparaison entre le texte masorétique et la version de la Septante, telle qu'elle est représentée par le Codex Vaticanus, révèle que, à part de menues différences, dans la version de la Septante deux épisodes manquent: vv. 10-11: «Saül jette sa lance sur David» et vv. 17-19: «Saül propose à David d'épouser sa fille aînée, Mèrav». Le premier est un récit parallèle au récit qu'on trouve plus loin, 19,9-10 et le

⁽¹⁾ "La critique biblique à la lumière des Archives royales de Mari: Jos 8", *Bib* 75 (1994) 70-74.

⁽²⁾ M. H. SEGAL, *Les livres de Samuel* (Jérusalem 1956; en hébreu) 149.

second contredit le récit qui se trouve dans le même chapitre, vv. 20-27 (voir notamment vv. 22 et 25 d'une part et v. 23 de l'autre⁽³⁾). Les deux épisodes, qui manquent dans le Codex Vaticanus, proviennent soit des fragments d'un autre document soit d'ajouts tardifs⁽⁴⁾. Or, d'après le texte massorétique, Saül propose d'abord à David d'épouser sa fille Mèrav: «Voici ma fille aînée Mèrav. C'est elle que je te donnerai pour femme» (1 S 18,17aβγ), puis il prémédite d'offrir sa seconde fille à David: «Je la lui donnerai» (1 S 18,21aβ) en précisant: «*bšty m tthn by hywm*». Cette dernière locution manque dans le Codex Vaticanus. Ce fait renforce l'avis de bon nombre de commentateurs qui pensent qu'il s'agit d'«an evident interpolation» selon Smith⁽⁵⁾ ou une «harmonizing remark, cross reference» selon Tov⁽⁶⁾, qui contredit le v. 22 et cherche à concilier le récit de Mikal, vv. 20-27 avec celui de Mèrav, vv. 17-19.

Qu'il s'agisse d'un verset original ou non, il est clair, nous semble-t-il, que l'auteur, ou, si on veut, l'interpolateur, en écrivant cette phrase, faisait allusion au double mariage de David avec Mèrav et avec Mikal. Or, en lisant une lettre des Archives royales de Mari (ARMT XXVI/2 n° 303)⁽⁷⁾, nous nous sommes demandé s'il ne se trouve pas aussi, sous-jacente, une allusion à une faveur exceptionnelle qu'un suzerain peut accorder à son vassal. En dépit du fait qu'une distance d'environ un millénaire sépare le récit biblique de la lettre de Mari, leur comparaison, *mutatis mutandis*, sans être entraîné par une *parallélomanie*, et sans vouloir se livrer à un comparatisme excessif, nous permet tout de même de mieux connaître le milieu de vie évoqué par cette locution biblique.

Avant d'entrer dans la discussion sur le contenu de la lettre en question, il faut la situer de point de vue historique et géographique. Nous nous trouvons à la 9^e année de Zimri-Lim, roi de Mari (1765-1764 avant notre ère). Au début de l'année, au 1^{er} ou 2nd mois, une force expéditionnaire de 30 000 hommes, composée de 20 000 Éšnunnéens et 10 000 Élamites, dans laquelle s'est trouvé Atamrum, le roi d'Allaḥad, a envahi la Haute Mésopotamie. La cible de l'expédition était la ville de Šeḥnā, un autre nom pour Šubat-Enlil. L'armée a commencé sa route en remontant le Tigre en direction de la ville de Mankisum et de là elle a eu l'intention de marcher sur Ekallātum avant de foncer vers Šubartum. Sur le chemin vers Ekallātum, elle a assiégé la ville de Šitullum, qui se trouve au nord de Mankisum, et l'a probablement conquise. Nous ne possédons pas de témoignage sur la conquête même de la ville de Šeḥnā, mais nous savons seulement que la ville

⁽³⁾ Cfr. J. WELLHAUSEN, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen 1871) 111; K. BUDDE, *Die Bücher Richter und Samuel* (Giessen 1890) 217; SEGAL, *Samuel*, 149-150; E. TOV, "The Composition of 1 Samuel 16-18 in the Light of the Septuagint Version", *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (éd. J.H. Tigay) (Philadelphie 1985) 116.

⁽⁴⁾ Cfr. WELLHAUSEN, *Samuel*, 112; BUDDE, *Richter und Samuel*, 217-219; H. P. SMITH, *Samuel* (ICC; Edinburgh 1899) 168; SEGAL, *Samuel*, 150; TOV, "1 Samuel 16-18", 122.

⁽⁵⁾ SMITH, *Samuel*, 172.

⁽⁶⁾ TOV, "1 Samuel 16-18", 116, 123.

⁽⁷⁾ D. CHARPIN - F. JOANNES - S. LACKENBACHER - B. LAFONT, *Archives épistolaires de Mari I/2* (ARMT XXVI/2; Paris 1988) pp. 56-59.

fut contrôlée par l'Élam. En ce qui concerne la date de la mainmise sur Šeḥnā, nous savons seulement que le 10 du 4^e mois, l'Élamite Kunnam s'est trouvé dans la ville. La conquête élamite fut une cause d'inquiétude pour Yamšûm, le commandant de la garnison mariote à Ilānšûra, car elle mettait en danger aussi la ville d'Ilānšûrā. Dans la lettre ARMT XXVI/2 n° 303, Yamšûm raconte que la réaction de Ḫāya-sûmû, le roi d'Ilānšûrā, le plus important parmi les alliés de Zimri-Lim dans la Haute Mésopotamie, devant le danger, fut celle de la peur, sachant Zimri-Lim au loin et, en voulant faire allégeance au nouveau pouvoir, il a eu l'intention d'aller à Šeḥnā chez Kunnam, le représentant d'Élam dans la ville. Yamšûm a essayé de l'empêcher d'accomplir son désir. Il fut aidé par Ulluri, arrivé dans la région, probablement avec une promesse d'aide de la part de Zimri-Lim. Ḫāya-sûmû ne se fie pas à l'aide de Zimri-Lim en rappelant le sort de Šubram, le roi de Susa, et Sammêtar, le roi d'Ašnakkum, qui fut probablement conquise par Élam et Ešnunna. Yamšûm et Ulluri ont réussi à persuader Ḫāya-sûmû qu'il ne se rende pas à Šeḥnā. Néanmoins, il a envoyé à sa place deux de ses serviteurs qui ont prêté serment à Kunnam et à deux autres individus qui étaient les ennemis de Ḫāya-sûmû. Par la suite Yamšûm rapporte le discours des émissaires élamites à propos de l'intention du Souverain d'Élam d'assiéger la ville de Babylone. Dans une autre lettre (ARMT XXVI/2 n° 305), écrite elle aussi probablement par Yamšûm (le début manque), celui-ci raconte que Ḫāya-sûmû se moque de l'aide promise par Zimri-Lim pour le sauver, en disant qu'il le sauvera comme il avait sauvé Qarni-Lim! Cela prouve, entre autres, que la ville d'Andarig fut conquise elle aussi par les envahisseurs. De même, Yamšûm transmet l'information qui est parvenue à Šimtum, l'épouse de Ḫāya-sûmû, d'après laquelle deux émissaires ont été envoyés à Šeḥnā. Il s'avère que Ḫāya-sûmû s'est prosterné devant Kunnam et a lui offert un cadeau constitué d'argent, d'or, d'ovins et de bovins. À son retour, il reproche à Yamšûm que Zimri-Lim ne fasse pas la paix avec Élam. En dépit du fait que le contexte est endommagé, on peut conclure que Zimri-Lim s'apprête à combattre Élam.

Après avoir dressé l'arrière-plan historique de la lettre ARMT XXVI/2 n° 303, nous allons reproduire la traduction de la lettre⁽⁸⁾:

1'-12' «[...] je veux aller à Šeḥnā chez Kunnam». J' {= Yamšûm} ai dit: «Addi-Addu, ton adversaire, et Yašîm-Addu demeurent là-bas. N'y va pas, (sinon) ils affaibliront ta position». Le lendemain, Ulluri est arrivé et nous avons exposé devant lui {= Ḫāya-sûmû} le message dont mon seigneur l'avait chargé. Il s'est levé et a dit: «Vous m'avez sauvé autant que vous avez sauvé Šubram (le roi de Susa) et Sammêtar (le roi d'Ašnakkum)!»

13'-33' Alors Ulluri s'est levé et lui a dit en face: «N'est-ce pas toi qui les as conduits à leur perte par suite de tes manigances?» Alors je me suis levé et j'ai dit: «Devant ta faute, tu ne dis pas: "C'est ma faute"! Ne sais-tu pas que là où mon seigneur met son empreinte, c'est le

⁽⁸⁾ La traduction est essentiellement celle de Charpin en ARMT XXVI/2 n° 303.

salut? Depuis que Samsî-Addu est mort, il y a quatre rois puissants {Ḥammurabi, Rīm-Sîn, Amūd-pī-El et Yarīm-Lim} (°). Mais ils n'ont pas épousé deux filles de (la race de) Yaḥdun-Lim. Présentement, *des filles de mon seigneur, tu en as épousé deux*. Or, tu as proféré des sarcasmes à l'égard de mon seigneur! Ne sais-tu pas que sans troupes alliées, à la porte d'Andarig, mon seigneur a chassé le sire d'Ešnunna, un roi puissant? Pourquoi profères-tu des sarcasmes à l'égard de mon seigneur? Ne sais-tu pas que la lance de Zimri-Lim et des Ḥanéens est plus forte que celle du pays entier?»

34'-44' Présentement, que mon seigneur fasse très attention à cette tablette. Maintenant, c'est Ulluri, un serviteur de mon seigneur digne de confiance, qui lui (= à Ḥāya-sūmû) a fait des reproches face à face. Ulluri et moi, nous lui avons fait la leçon, et de ce fait il n'est pas allé à Šeḥnā. Mais comme il avait envoyé à sa place Šūriya et Aqba-abum, ils ont prêté serment avec Kunnam, Addi-Addu et Yašim-Addu.

45'-54' Présentement, les messagers du Suzerain {d'Élam} demeurent avec les rois. Voici ce qu'ils disent: «Mettez fin à vos dissensions et venez! Je vais mettre le siège devant Babylone». Or le pays tourne sa face vers mon seigneur. Et maintenant, Ḥāya-sūmû est inquiet. Que mon seigneur veille à ne pas être négligent. Que mon seigneur réfléchisse [...]. (Lacune).

3"-6" Autre chose. Écris-lui en ces termes: «Viens-t'en chez moi, afin que nous réfléchissions et que nous fassions ce qu'il faut».

7"-10" Dis à mon seigneur: que mon seigneur <donne> une lance pour la main de Rabûm.

Charpin résume ainsi l'épisode concernant le mariage de Ḥāya-sūmû: «Yamšûm se lança dans une étonnante apologie de Zimri-Lim (n° 303 [A. 1168] 17'-33'). Il commença par abaisser l'orgueil de Ḥāya-sūmû et exalter la puissance de son maître (ll. 17'-19'). Puis il rappela au roi d'Ilân-šurâ la faveur extraordinaire que Zimri-Lim lui avait faite en lui donnant deux de ses filles comme épouses» (10).

Par d'autres sources nous pouvons conclure que la première fille, Šimtum, a épousé Ḥāya-sūmû avant le milieu de l'année ZL 1' (1773/1772 avant notre ère), peut-être durant l'année *bit abišu* (1775-1774 avant notre ère), et que la seconde fille, Kirûm, l'a épousé le 9^e ou 10^e mois de l'année ZL 2' (1772-1771 avant notre ère). Charpin écrit par la suite: «Yamšûm au n° 303 (A. 1168) place d'ailleurs la faveur très nettement sur un plan politique. (...) le mariage de Kirûm eut-il sans doute pour but de récompenser Ḥāya-sūmû en lui accordant une marque d'estime inhabituelle, et par là même de resserrer encore les liens entre Mari et Ilân-šurâ, cette alliance étant la pièce maîtresse du dispositif de contrôle du Haut-Pays par Zimri-Lim» (11).

(°) Cfr. ARMT XXVI/2, p. 58, n.j.

(10) ARMT XXVI/2, p. 37.

(11) ARMT XXVI/2, pp. 44-45.

Dans l'introduction à notre enquête nous avons suggéré que la lettre de Mari allait nous aider à trouver la bonne traduction et l'origine de la phrase que nous préoccupe. En effet, en ce qui concerne la traduction, il ne faut pas la laisser « unsolved »⁽¹²⁾, mais tout simplement suivre celle donnée par le Codex Alexandrinus: εν ταις δυσιν « by two ... i.e. by a double tie »⁽¹³⁾. Il nous semble qu'en écrivant cette phrase le scribe ou l'interpolateur pensait à ces mariages diplomatiques exceptionnels où un suzerain donne deux de ses filles en mariage à son vassal préféré comme signe d'estime hors de pair⁽¹⁴⁾. Il va de soi que les relations décrites dans le récit biblique ne sont pas du type suzerain - vassal, mais qu'on fait seulement allusion à une coutume tirée de la vie diplomatique internationale de l'époque.

11 Arnon Street
Tel Aviv 63455
Israel

Moshé Anbar

⁽¹²⁾ SMITH, *Samuel*, 174.

⁽¹³⁾ SMITH, *Samuel*, 174.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Cfr. J. D. LEVENSON et B. HALPERN, "The Political Import of David's Marriages", *JBL* 99 (1980) 507-518.

Two Notes on Psalm 37

The purpose of this note is to suggest alternate interpretations of Ps 37,3 and 37,37. While the usual translations of these verses seem at first glance unexceptionable, the readings proposed here pay closer attention to the contexts of these verses and to their poetic character.

Ps 37,3: *bēṭaḥ byhwh wa'āšēh ṭōb*
šēkon 'ereṣ ūrē'ēh 'ēmūnā
 Trust in YHWH and do good;
 dwell in the land and feed on fidelity.

While the general sense of v. 3 is clear, the meaning of the last two words is not immediately apparent⁽¹⁾. The translation of the *NRSV* is representative: "Trust in the Lord, and do good; so you will live in the land, and enjoy security." One way of resolving the ambiguity of *rē'ēh 'ēmūnā* is to emend the text; on the basis of the LXX's rendering of *'ēmūnā* as *epi tō ploutō autēs*, some have proposed reading *hāmōnā* ("its [i.e., the land's] riches") in place of MT's *'ēmūnā* ("fidelity, reliability"). Dahood reaches the same conclusion without emendation, by positing *'āmōn* as a biform of *hāmōn*⁽²⁾.

The purpose of this note is to suggest the retention of the MT, understanding *'ēmūnā* in its normal sense of "fidelity, reliability." As object of the verb *rā'ā* ("graze, feed upon"), "reliability" is an abstract noun with the contextual concrete sense of "reliable food supply"⁽³⁾. This meaning for *'ēmūnā* is supported by the occurrence of the verb *'ānaq* ("delight in") in v. 4, a verb connected with food in Isa 55,3; 58,14; 66,11⁽⁴⁾.

Another observation can be made on *ūrē'ēh 'ēmūnā*, on the basis of its position in the acrostic poem. V. 3, beginning with *bēṭaḥ*, is the *beth* verse of the acrostic. As the second letter of the alphabet, *beth* corresponds to the *šin* verse, the second letter from the end of the alphabet⁽⁵⁾. In these two

⁽¹⁾ A. A. ANDERSON, *Psalms* 1 (Greenwood 1977) 293, describes it as "an ambiguous Hebrew phrase".

⁽²⁾ M. DAHOOD, *Psalms* I (AB 16; Garden City, NY 1966) 228; followed by G. RAVASI, *Il libro dei Salmi* I (Bologna 1986) 679-680. This approach receives some support from the occurrence of *hāmōn* in v. 16.

⁽³⁾ On abstract nouns with concrete meanings, see W. G. E. WATSON, *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques* (JSOTSS 26; Sheffield 1984) 314-316.

⁽⁴⁾ Note that the retention of the MT means that v. 3 is bracketed by two terms (*bēṭaḥ*, "trust"; *'ēmūnā*, "fidelity, reliability") that occur as a synonymous parallel pair in Mic 7,5.

⁽⁵⁾ See B. J. ROBERTS, "Athbash", *IDB* I, 306-307. Other such subtle devices in the acrostic form of Ps 37 can be noted: (1) In an article forthcoming in the Roland Murphy Festschrift, M. L. Barré has noted the use of what he calls "terminative terms" at the ends of poems or sections of poems. In Ps 37,20 (the *kaph* verse, ending the first half of the Hebrew alphabet), the twofold occurrence of the verb

corresponding verses, there is a wordplay involving the similarity of the two imperative verbs *ûrē'ēh* ("graze") in v. 3, and *ûrē'ēh* ("see") in v. 37. Further, both verbs have abstract nouns as their objects: in v. 3, "graze on *ēmûnâ*" ("reliability"); in v. 37, "see *yāšār*" ("the upright one"; or *yōšer*, "uprightness"). And while *yāšār/yōšer* does not occur in parallelism with *ēmûnâ*, it does parallel a synonym from the same root (*ēmet*) in Qoh 12,10; Neh 9,13; note as well *be'ēmet wēyāšār* in Ps 111,8⁽⁶⁾.

Ps 37,37: *šēmôr tām ûrē'ēh yāšār*

Observe the blameless and take note of the upright.

Again, the *NRSV* translation is typical: "Mark the blameless and note the upright." The sense seems to be that the psalmist, having seen the downfall of the wicked, now counsels the audience (the sage's pupils) to learn wisdom by considering the conduct of the blameless and upright person (cf. Job 1,1.8; 2,3). If, as some suggest, the words are revocalized as *tām* ("integrity, blamelessness") and *yōšer* ("uprightness"), then the poet would be holding up not the person but the quality for consideration.

Dahood takes a different tack, analyzing *tām* and *yāšār* as "two divine messengers who lead the way to virtue": "Heed Sir Honest and mark Sir Upright"⁽⁷⁾. The personification or hypostatization of such characteristics is a regular feature of ancient Near Eastern polytheism and occurs in attenuated and demythologized form in the OT⁽⁸⁾.

Given the importance of context as an interpretive field, I would propose deriving the meaning of this colon of poetry from its context, specifically from *ûšēmôr darkô* ("keep to his [YHWH's] way") in v. 34. The repeated imperatives *šēmôr/šēmôr* bring into relationship vv. 34 and 37 and may suggest that *tām* and *yāšār* in v. 37 are meant to be associated with *derek* in v. 34⁽⁹⁾: "Keep to the blameless [way], and consider the upright [way]/[the way of] the upright." The "blameless way" is a frequently occurring motif in the wisdom literature: see *tōm derek* in Prov 10,29; *tām*

kālû ("be finished, be at an end") is such a terminative indicator (cf. Ps 72,20). (2) The only occurrences of 1st-pers. verbs in the poem occur in v. 25, the *nun* verse (*hāyîti...rā'îti*) and in v. 35, the *reš* verse (*rā'îti*); it is noteworthy that the *nun* verse is the third letter from the beginning of the second part of the Hebrew alphabet (*lamed* to *taw*), while the *reš* verse is the third from the end. On the division of the Hebrew alphabet into two (equal) parts (*aleph* to *kaph* and *lamed* to *taw*), see M. D. COOGAN, "Alphabets and Elements", *BASOR* 216 (1974) 61-63; also N. J. McELENENY, "153 Great Fish (John 21,11) – Gematriacal Atbash", *Bib* 58 (1977) 411-417.

⁽⁶⁾ Y. AVISHUR, *Stylistic Studies of Word-Pairs in Biblical and Ancient Semitic Literatures* (AOAT 210; Kevalaer-Neukirchen-Vluyn 1984) 194. There seem to be no other cases of a word play involving *rā'â* ("see") and *rā'â* ("graze, feed on"); for the exhaustive collection of which, see I. M. CASANOWICZ, "Paronomasia in the Old Testament", *JBL* 12 (1893) 105-167.

⁽⁷⁾ DAHOOD, *Psalms* 1, 232.

⁽⁸⁾ See Pss 25,21; 43,3; 57,4; 62,8.

⁽⁹⁾ The occurrence of *yišrē dārek* ("those who walk uprightly" in *NRSV*) in Ps 37,14 gives some support to seeing *yāšār* in v. 37 as connected with *derek* in v. 34.

dārek in Prov 13,6; *wētōm dērākeykā* in Job 4,6; *derek tāmīm* in Ps 101,2.6; and *tēmīmē dārek* in Ps 119,1; Prov 11,20. And for the “upright way/way of the upright”⁽¹⁰⁾, see *derek yāšār* in Prov 14,12; 16,25; 1 Sam 12,23 (*wēhōrētī ’etkem bēderek haṭṭōbā wēhayyēšārā* [“I will instruct you in the good and the upright way”])⁽¹¹⁾; and Ps 5,9 (*hayšar* [K *hwšr*] *lēpānay darkekā* [“make straight your way before me”])⁽¹²⁾. And while there are no other instances of *derek tām/yāšār* as objects of the verb *šmr*, similar and equivalent expressions can be found in Prov 2,20 (*wē’orhōt šaddīqīm tišmōr*: “you shall keep to the paths of the righteous”) and in Prov 13,6 (*šēdāqā tiššōr tām dārek*: “righteousness guards the one whose way is upright”)⁽¹³⁾. Such an understanding of the text would be consonant with the terse and allusive character of poetry, including the poetry of the Bible⁽¹⁴⁾.

Weston Jesuit School of Theology
Cambridge, MA 02138

John A. KSELMAN, S.S.

⁽¹⁰⁾ See also Job 22,3: *wē’im beša’ ki tattēm dērākeykā* (“and is there any gain [for Shaddai] if you make your ways blameless?”); and note as well such equivalent expressions as *’orhōt yōšer* (“paths of uprightness”) in Prov 2,13; and *bēma’gēlē yōšer* (“in the paths of uprightness”) in Prov 4,11.

⁽¹¹⁾ Cf. Prov 4,11: *bēderek ḥokmā hōrētikā / hidraktikā bēma’gēlē yōšer* (“I instruct/have instructed you in the way of wisdom: I direct/have directed you in the paths of uprightness”).

⁽¹²⁾ For “making straight [*yšr*, *piel*] ways/paths”, see Prov 3,6; 9,15; 11,5; Isa 26,7; 45,13.

⁽¹³⁾ For *nšr* as a synonym of *šmr*, see AVISHUR, *Stylistic Studies*, 328, 453. Also note Prov 23,26 (reading with the qere and the versions *tiššōrnā* for ketib *tršnh*): “My son, pay attention to me; and let your eyes watch my ways”.

⁽¹⁴⁾ In a recent book on Hebrew poetry, S.E. GILLINGHAM, *The Poems and Psalms of the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford 1994) 20-23, identified terseness of style, ambiguity of meaning, and the use of ellipsis as among the characteristics of Hebrew poetry.

RES BIBLIOGRAPHICAE

The Sermon on the Mount in Recent Study

1995 was a banner year for the study of the Sermon on the Mount. Thirteen years ago H. Frankemölle declared 1982 the year of the Sermon on the Mount (henceforth SM), because over ten books had been published on it in Germany, one became a bestseller (H. Alt), and for a time the newspapers were full of it, much of the uproar due to political debates⁽¹⁾. In 1995 the situation is less politically and militarily charged, and hence more calm. Two major works have appeared, each quite different from the other, by Marcel Dumais and Hans Dieter Betz respectively⁽²⁾. Dumais' work is primarily a review and summary of research especially over the last twenty-five years, with a relatively restrained amount of personal views, whereas Betz's work, while also reviewing much literature, is more of an independent study, with a peculiar point of view, viz., its emphasis on the classical, Greco-Roman cultural background. Dumais' recapitulative accent is explained by the circumstance that his study was originally commissioned as an article in the *Dictionnaire de la Bible Supplément*, and originally published there. There is also an obvious difference in scale, 331 p. versus 695 p. Both works are resolutely academic and are not likely to provoke public controversy, yet both are a boon for the serious student. Betz intends to be measured against F.A.G. Tholuck's monumental three-volume work of 1833, not against Dumais.

I

We can thus be relatively brief in reviewing Dumais. It goes without saying that the student will find here a reliable source of information both on the Sermon as a whole and on each section, with ample if not exhaustive bibliographies. Unfortunately no indices are provided. The first part treats the history of interpretation (rather briefly), the theological, historical and literary problems posed by the Sermon, the relation of the Matthean SM to the Lucan Sermon on the Plain (henceforth SP), the relation of the two sermons to their respective gospels, the structure and literary genre of the two sermons, and the Jewish and Hellenistic backgrounds. The second part

⁽¹⁾ H. FRANKEMÖLLE, "Neue Literatur zur Bergpredigt", *TRev* 19 (1983) 177-198.

⁽²⁾ Marcel DUMAIS, *Le sermon sur la montagne. État de la recherche. Interprétation. Bibliographie*. Paris, Letouzey et Ané, 1995. 331 p. 16 × 24. FF 199; Hans Dieter BETZ, *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, including the Sermon on the Plain* (Matthew 5:3-7:27 and Luke 6:20-49) (Hermeneia). Minneapolis, MN, Fortress Press, 1995. xxxviii-695 p. 21,5 × 24.

of the book, on the interpretation of the SM section by section, begins with a warning not to expect a detailed exegesis. Rather, for each section one will find a selective, especially recent, bibliography; then, depending on the case, a study of the redactional history, the structure, the literary form, and the background (OT and Judaism) of the passage; then the general sense of the text is given, in the light of the authors cited in the bibliography. In this part Dumais takes the SP seriously, yet he does not undertake a completely separate treatment of the SP, and in this differs from Betz. The work concludes with a systematic treatment of Christian existence according to the SM. The book is dedicated to Dom Jacques Dupont and follows his lead wherever possible.

In reacting to the book the first task is to point out the author's main original contribution, and then to formulate some criticisms. In his analysis of the structure of the Sermon (84-91), D. follows the path chartered by Giavini, Grundmann, Schweizer and Bornkamm in locating the Lord's Prayer at the center. But he goes beyond them in noticing that in addition to the thematic terms kingdom of God (8x) and justice (5x), there are also 17 references to the Father in the SM; these are concentrated principally in the central section (10x in 6,1-18). An awareness of this thematic density heightens the religious, the theo-logical dimension of the ethics of the text. It leads the author to some impressive reflections on the relation Father, sons, brothers, based on 5,45.48, as well as on 6,1-18. But he does not notice that the section 6,19-7,12, difficult to organize in any case, can be understood as containing further instructions on how to love God with one's whole heart (v. 21), one's two *yēšārīm* (v. 24), soul (i.e., life, v. 25) and strength (wealth, throughout vv. 19-34); cf. *m. Ber.* 9,5, and B. Gerhards-son, *The Shema in the NT* (Lund 1996). This would have strengthened his theocentric argument which is his main contribution.

Among criticisms. we may mention that D. does not discuss the view that 5,21-48 can be read as a commentary on the second part of the Decalogue and related Pentateuchal laws. This neglect contributes to his not asking the question, what is the relation of the SM to catechesis, i.e., the use of the beatitudes, the hypertheses, the Lord's Prayer in the instruction of new Christians? D. could reasonably reply that catechesis was not part of his task, yet he is known for his earlier study of and contribution to the responsible "actualization" of the Scriptures. Indeed, his concern for contemporary application occasionally leads him to anachronistic statements, e.g., the timeless destiny of the SM (112), the beatitude of the mourners can be applied to those who grieve because more people today do not seem to care about God, Christ, spiritual values (146). The main point is however that Matt 5,21-48 centers Jesus' ethical teaching around major OT ethical texts, and thus justifies the use of the Decalogue in catechetics.

D. is also somewhat careless in dating rabbinic parallels. In his brief treatment of the history of exegesis, D. repeats the usual presentation of the medieval distinction between the precepts which all the baptized are obliged to observe, and the counsels of perfection, reserved for a spiritual élite which freely chooses to pursue them. He rightly sees the major impetus in

the writings of the vigorous monastic reformer, Rupert of Deutz. But he does not refer to Brigitta Stoll's major work⁽³⁾. So he does not realize how radical Rupert's position was: salvation by grace is for the laity and secular clergy; salvation through the works of the SM was for the zealous monks. Rupert thus broke with the Augustinian line. It is thus incorrect to identify this with the position of Thomas Aquinas who remained a moderate Augustinian. Though D. refers to *S.T.*, I-II, qq. 107-108, he does not make it clear that there Thomas makes of the SM the written text of the *nova lex* intended for *all* Christian, in both its precepts and its counsels (q. 108, aa. 3-4), and that he there cites explicitly the statement of Augustine that the SM contains all the precepts leading to the perfection of the Christian life (q. 108, a. 3 sed c. et corp.).

The right way to understand the kingdom of God in the gospels continues to be debated. D.'s treatment (127-129) will not satisfy those like the reviewer who continue to see the origin of the theme in the book of Daniel, where nearly every chapter culminates in a statement about the kingdom, and where it is explicitly given to the "one like a Son of man". If this is the correct background, it follows that the kingdom represents a future theopolitical arrangement *on earth* (Matt 6,10) as it is in heaven, consisting morally in justice, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit (Rom 14,17; Matt 6,33). The perspective of Jesus' preaching of the kingdom remains predominantly future (Matt 4,17; 6,10), also in the beatitudes, though there is an anticipation of it (e.g., Matt 12,28) in the ministry of Jesus and in the life of faith. But the believers is still offered a twofold hope, for the future of this world, through a new divine intervention into history, the coming of the Son of man with his kingdom (Matt 16,28), and eternal life (19,16.17.29) at the resurrection (22,23.28.30.31). (Admittedly, the earthly perspective is not always sharply distinguished from the heavenly, but this is precisely because both form part of the hope for the *future*.) This is one place where D. would have done well to follow Dupont more faithfully, even though his concern for a *present* experience of the kingdom is understandable from a Lucan, and from a pastoral, point of view.

D. generally ignores the views of modern philosophers on the SM⁽⁴⁾. He does adduce S. Kierkegaard on 6,25-34 (273) appropriately. But he does not mention Nietzsche's rejection of the SM as a slave morality, and Scheler's reply that, on the contrary, the pardon of enemies represents the beau geste of a nobleman's ethic.

D.'s generally good judgment slips on the crucial verses 5,17-20, the principles of the law. He follows the view that v.18d ("until all is accomplished") is to be understood differently from v. 18b ("until heaven and earth pass away"), and refers to the death and resurrection of Jesus, not to the parousia. This is literarily unlikely, since the two "until" clauses are in strict parallelism and serve as a frame to the central assertion, that the law

⁽³⁾ *De Virtute in Virtutem: Zur Auslegung- und Wirkungsgeschichte der Bergpredigt in Kommentaren, Predigten und hagiographischer Literatur von der Merowingerzeit bis um 1200* (BGBE 30; Tübingen 1988).

⁽⁴⁾ They are conveniently gathered in X. TILLIETTE's *Le Christ de la Philosophie* (Paris 1990).

will not pass away. A glance at three recent commentaries, Gnilka, Betz and Davies-Allison, shows that they all recognize that the reference to the passion of Christ is an extraneous and artificial harmonization with Paul. Davies, who in 1957 argued intensely for this view, has given it up as eisegetical. D. would do well to consult the old article by H.J. Schoeps⁽⁵⁾, where a sharp distinction is made between Matthew's acceptance of the *written* Torah, and his rejection of the Pharisaic oral Torah. Even in those hypertheses where Matthew's Jesus seems to be abrogating the written Torah (e.g., on oaths or divorce), he never does so in a laxist sense; his views on divorce can be understood as within the range of opinion permissible among Jewish sages of his day⁽⁶⁾.

This criticism leads into the most serious disagreement of all. It concerns how the command to love our enemies is to be understood. D. courageously states (214) that the teaching of Matt 5,39b-42 is not to be understood as including a prudent or interested calculation that one can thereby win over ("again") or convert one's adversary. He asserts that nothing in the text permits such an interpretation, though he admits that this was the interpretation of the Didache (1,3 "and you will have no enemy"; cf. 6,2), and, we may add, of Rom 12,14-21. He then in the next paragraph says that these words of Jesus are not to be taken literally! He repeats his unconditional interpretation (222) and then argues for it (223-224) on the basis of the threefold *poia hymin charis estin* ("what grace is to you?") of Luke 6,32.33.34. Against Fitzmyer and Bovon's commentaries (and, we may add, the majority of translations), D. holds that *charis* here should be given its full sense of grace and not be reduced to that of reward or credit, as the *misthos* of Luke 6,35 and the Matthean parallels would lead one to think. The debate may be characterized as one between a romantic-idealist, impractical and unjewish interpretation and a calculating, prudential, conversionary, educational interpretation. The second view is based on a general estimate of the character of Matthew's ethic. In detail it is based on the principle stated in 5,17, "I have come not to abolish but to fulfill". This permits, when taken with the degrees or stages of moral development sketched in 5,38-48, a moral calculus which argues that in some cases the moral sensitivity of the opponent is sufficiently developed so that a non-violent response is appropriate (we may think of Gandhi making such a calculus in regard to Lord Halifax), but in other cases the moral level of the opponents is so low that such a response would be useless (e.g., Stalin or Hitler). In such cases, the believer may resort to lower levels of biblical teaching, in self-defence. This in fact has been the policy of most Christian bodies throughout the centuries, and it need not exclude risk-taking, heroic virtue and sanctity, or conscientious objection by individuals. It is supported especially by Rom 12,14-21, which concludes "Do not be conquered (*nika*) by evil but conquer evil with good" (v. 21), by the Didache, and by the two swords of Luke 22,36-38. In

⁽⁵⁾ «Jésus et la loi juive», *RHPR* 33 (1953) 1-20.

⁽⁶⁾ See the important article by R. NEUDECKER, "Das 'Ehescheidungsgesetz' von Dtn 24,1-4 nach altjüdischer Auslegung", *Bib* 75 (1994) 350-387.

the matter of the reward, there is perhaps a confusion in D. between the Matthean and Lucan perspectives. Even if "grace" were the correct translation of *charis* in Luke, this would not necessarily provide the appropriate key to Matthew's point of view. Within the Matthean perspective we may distinguish different kinds of rewards. Usually authors distinguish here between crassly material and spiritual, other-worldly rewards. It is however doubtful whether the Matthean Jesus would have accepted such a sharp antithesis. His perspective is of concern for justice and the future kingdom of God. It is thus essentially social. He offers wise teaching which will prepare for and hasten the coming of the kingdom by a radical instruction on the resolution of human conflicts by breaking the cycle of violence. To the extent that human beings live by this instruction, the Matthean Jesus could reasonably foresee that they would be better off, even in this world. due to the "peace dividend"; better off *even* materially, although even more so morally and spiritually. It is difficult to do justice here both to the innovative, revolutionary character of Jesus' teaching on non-violence (which always leads some to judge it as romantic, impractical and unjewish) and its (in the long term) hardheaded, practical, realistic wisdom. One can however, in the light of two thousand years of struggle to receive this teaching, begin to think that its wisdom is finally being taken seriously even on the level of states and governments⁽⁷⁾. Despite these disagreements, it is obvious that this is a book worth wrestling with.

II

Betz's massive achievement has its roots in his work on his Galatians commentary, when, as he says, "the extraordinarily intimate, more precisely adversarial, relationship of ... Galatians and the SM continued to force itself on me"⁽⁸⁾. Thus from the start a Bultmannian Lutheran perspective controls the agenda, even though that does not explain all the positions taken. B. prepared carefully for his commentary, one might say that he earned the right to write it, by a series of seven preliminary studies, which were subsequently published as a book in German and English (see previous note). There the main theses peculiar to B.'s approach were clearly stated and are not now revoked. Scholars have therefore had time to react to them in detail. The three principal review articles⁽⁹⁾ do not accept these theses but submit them to a searching criticism which has convinced this reviewer. The theses may be reduced to three. The first is that the SM is a *corpus separatum*, not ascribable either to the historical Jesus or to the final

⁽⁷⁾ B. URQUHART, *A Life in Peace and War* (New York 1987) 248-249.

⁽⁸⁾ H.D. BETZ, *Essays on the Sermon on the Mount* (Philadelphia 1985) x; id., *Studien zur Bergpredigt* (Tübingen 1985).

⁽⁹⁾ D.C. ALLISON, Jr., "A New Approach to the Sermon on the Mount", *ETL* 64 (1988) 405-414. C.E. CARLSTON, "Betz on the Sermon on the Mount: A Critique", *CBQ* 50 (1988) 47-57; G.N. STANTON, "The Origin and Purpose of the Sermon on the Mount", *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament* (FS. E.E. Ellis; [eds G.F. HAWTHORNE - O. BETZ] Grand Rapids - Tübingen 1987) 181-194, reprinted in G.N. STANTON, *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Edinburgh 1992) 307-325. My own brief review appeared in *RB* 94 (1987) 147-148.

redaction of Q or to Matthew the Greek evangelist. It is the product of Greek-speaking Jewish Christians around A.D. 50, written polemically against other Jews, and was taken over virtually without alteration by both Q and Matthew. It is isolated yet linked with the SP, which is designed for disciples coming from paganism. The second thesis is that the SM is engaged in a polemical dialogue with Hellenistic philosophy, a dialogue whose literary genre is the Epicurean-Stoic epitome of the master's doctrines. The third is that the SM's soteriology does not depend on the saving death and resurrection of Jesus but on the good works and moral righteousness of his followers. The SM is characterized by a relatively low Christology, one in which Jesus is neither Son of man nor Son of God (cf. *Sermon*, 145, 147-149). B.'s rejection of the criticisms already published suggests that he prefers an eccentric position. Yet it would be closer to the truth to say that the work as a whole is a combination of centrist and eccentric views, of sudden concessions to the commonplace and odd independent views.

The first two of these theses cannot be taken seriously as historically true (they shatter on the reefs of Q and Matthean redaction). Perhaps they are not even intended as such. But they can be accepted as *Denkproben*, as hypotheses which challenge our habitual ways of thinking. For example, B. tries to interpret the SM *against* the Matthean redaction. This is both odd and ultimately useless since Matthean redaction is so obviously present in the SM, but it is an interesting experiment. The third, Christological, thesis is exaggerated but based on the restraint in the SM regarding *explicit* Christology. The problem could be easily solved if the frequent mention of the kingdom of God in the SM always and automatically implied a reference to Daniel 7 and thus implicitly to the Son of man, as I tend to think. Or is the SM like the later targums, where there is frequent mention of the kingdom of God and of king-Messiah but not of the Son of man? This is becoming a major issue in Q and historical Jesus research.

The present reviewer presupposes the criticisms of the *Essays*. He will concentrate on some of the same issues as newly presented in the commentary, as well as on some other aspects which have emerged on reading through the larger work, especially in regard to the value as well as the doubtfulness of B.'s *interpretatio graeca*, adding some interpretations of his own.

The work will be used by two kinds of readers, those who read the whole work, and those who refer to it for light on a particular passage. Both need to know what to expect. The accent here is on the SP, on the Hellenistic context, on the German Protestant tradition of scholarship, and not on the OT or rabbinics (for which one may consult Davies-Allison and Luz), though there is much OT and rabbinics presented in any case. German Protestantism in this context means first that B. picks up the pre-World War I tradition of German scholarship, with its sound classical learning and its openness to data from comparative religion, a prudent idea in itself, but not always, since it can lead to a neutral, non-committal tone which has a flat effect. (See his conclusion [618] on Luke 6,27-38. It is not false but it is missing the specific sense of joy, boldness and abundance

[*ekchynomenon*, v. 38] characteristic of the early Christian hope of the soon to come kingdom of God. To this extent it is theologically poor). A good example is his use of Harnack's great work on Marcion (10, 37, 176, 200-201, 530, 599). B. emphasizes the role of Marcion in the early interpretation of the SM, especially his use of the term "antithesis" to refer to Matt 5,21-48. This innovation has played a formative part in theological history ever since, often unconsciously, until Harnack reconstructed the details. Lack of awareness of this tainted origin has often bedeviled Matthean studies; we have had to wait until Pinchas Lapide⁽¹⁰⁾ to find a better term, "hypertheses", to describe what Matthew was doing. The second sense of German Protestantism for B. means that he is in steady dialogue with the commentaries of Luz and Strecker (and also of Guelich and Dupont where possible) in his study of the SM, but not of Davies-Allison or Gnika. The third, philological, sense is that he makes much use of *TWNT*, *EWNT*, *BAGD*, Spicq and especially of *RAC*, which may be described as his special weapon. Fourthly he takes a swipe at Peter as the rock (563-565) with the help of 1 Cor 3,10-15, and is able to find a hint of *simul iustus et peccator* (417) in Matt 6,15.

There is a surprise on almost every page awaiting even specialists. Why? Because B. freshens the bibliography by going beyond the exegetical literature to include classical studies. Two examples: to illumine the beatitudes B. adduces the Orphic gold leaves (95); on *praütēs* (meekness) he widens the lens by citing J. de Romilly's work *La douceur dans la pensée grecque*. The theme turns out to be not only a part of the biblical *anawim* complex but also a major theme of Hellenistic ethics, the virtue of the sage, like Buddha.

On the other hand, the grave difficulties of B.'s view emerge in his interpretation of justice in Matt 5,6 (129-132). Here B. presents the SM as purely Jewish, not even as Jewish Christian, whereas Matthew becomes purely Christian, which for B. means Pauline, and thus not Jewish-Christian either, not Hengel's "wanderer between two worlds". It is more likely that both the SM and Matthew were Jewish Christian, that untidy middle path which B. finds hard to envisage, and that for two reasons. (1) The Jewish Christianity of Matthew was of a moderate kind: written in Greek, after the fall of Jerusalem as a result of which it lost its power base and some of its hybris, it recognizes the mission to the Gentiles, admits Paul as part of the Christian movement even if not with enthusiasm (cf. 5,19 with 5,20), with whose followers it had to be in ecumenical dialogue; it contains two soteriologies in unreconciled tension, a legal-ethical one and a kerygmatic one; it remains (verbally at least) loyal to the written Torah, while quite critical of the Pharisaic oral Torah or halacha. Yet it remains silent about the need for circumcision, which means either that it accepts the decision echoed in Acts 15 or that it is remaining diplomatically discreet about its position. Matthew's Jewish Christianity is of the "orthodox" variety described/reconstructed by Daniélou, not the heterodox type studied by Schoeps. ("Orthodox" here means acceptable to the later great church

(10) P. LAPIDE, *The Sermon on the Mount* (Maryknoll 1986) 45-46.

which accepted Matthew [as well as Paul] into its canon.) (2) B.'s view of Matthew is flawed from the start in that he accepts (320) Strecker's view that Matthew was a Gentile writing for a church composed primarily of Gentiles. Hummel long ago warned that Strecker Lucanizes Matthew. This (Lucanized) Matthew should have used the SP, both logically and pastorally. Instead, on B.'s view, he preserves the SM as an isolated archaic foreign body, incompatible with his theology (327-328). Is this historically probable? B.'s answer (339) is that Matthew had a high tolerance of diversity and preserved the SM as a relic of former times, almost as a historical curiosity. This seems to imply that Matthew does not take the SM seriously. But 28,18-20 implies otherwise. In the end it remains incredible that Matthew and Luke who elsewhere have no hesitation to edit the material inherited from the Jesus tradition (Q and Mark) should here (SM/SP) refrain from all comment. Such an unreal, artificial position is meaningful only as a hypothesis of research, nothing more. (B.'s pages on the relationship between the SM and Paul [326-327, 546-548] contain an honest and courageous wrestling with a real problem).

One of the main differences between B.'s *Essays* and his commentary is that in the latter he confronts the SP in detail. He devotes 70 p. to it (571-640), more than most commentators do. One detects a certain loss of speed here, understandable enough, except for the four excursuses, some interesting *obiter dicta* and the comment on Luke 6,40 (622-626). He admits that the SM is intellectually stimulating (84); by comparison the SP is less interesting (88). More important, B.'s hypothesis is that both the SM and the SP were created by the early Jesus movement, one to instruct converts from Judaism, the other to instruct those coming from a Greek background, both around A.D. 50 (87-88). Thus B. thinks of the SP as separate from the Q sermon. This seems unlikely. The slight Hellenistic retouches are probably due to Lucan redaction (e.g., the "nows" in the beatitudes resemble the "daily" of 9,23 and 11,3). If so, then one could think of the SP as stemming from Q in its contents, with the historical cachet that that can connote (for Harnack and similarly historically-minded scholars), while at the same time accepting that in its present Lucan setting it has the literary form of a Hellenistic instruction. The two viewpoints, historical and literary, are both legitimate.

B. continues to deny any Son of man Christology to the SM (554-556), yet he admits it for the SP (582). Thus he embraces the paradox that the more Hellenistic of the two Sermons has the more Jewish, apocalyptic Christology. Once one accepts the link between Son of man and the kingdom of God (the latter frequent in the SM), B.'s interpretation of Matt 7,21-23 seems strained, though he remains basically correct on the soteriological consequences.

With regard to B.'s *interpretatio graeca*, a few general considerations are in order before we descend to particulars. On the one hand, the SM/SP, Jesus and Matthew all lived in the Roman empire which had a common public culture, Greek, expressed in two main languages, Greek and Latin, though provincial variants, even resistance, were strong, especially in

Palestine and Persia⁽¹¹⁾. It is not a question therefore of ruling out Hellenistic cultural influence altogether, but rather of a more exact determination of its relevance. Some years ago Quentin Quesnell provided a model of concentric circles as a help in exegetical method: in trying to interpret a passage in Matt, first appeal to other places in Matt, then to the NT, then to the Palestinian-South Syrian culture of the time (for our purpose, mainly the OT, Qumran, Josephus and early rabbinic traditions), and only then to the rest of the empire⁽¹²⁾. Thus one can affirm Hellenistic influence, but as tertiary or quaternary, not primary, remote not proximate, implicit rather than explicit, except perhaps to our own cultural presuppositions.

So with regard to the genre of the SM, its peculiar fusion of law, wisdom and apocalyptic has its closest parallel in the Qumran rules, not the philosopher's *epitome*. But even the *Serek* (1QS) is not an exact parallel or model (e.g., it has a poem and no parable). It is perhaps a disappointment to the learned, but the source to which Matt, the SM, and the rest of the NT make most frequent and public appeal is the OT (in its variety of text types, to be sure). One should start there⁽¹³⁾.

The positive side of B.'s Hellenism may be seen in his setting the biblical text in a larger than usual context. For example, before his exegesis of 5,17-20, he sets out the principles for the interpretation of law in Greek, Roman and Jewish thinking (167-173). If a reader had a strong classical Thomistic philosophical training, with emphasis on Aristotle, much of this would be known. But here it is updated, made more precise bibliographically, and related to the classical case of Socrates. For the reader without this training, much of what B. offers here will be new, fresh and beneficial. Original is his linking of 5,17-48 with the classical legal concern for equity or *epieikeia* (168-171, 194-195, 206-207). His interest in the Greek philosophers often brings him close to the church fathers, e.g., on usury and interest (604-612), since they shared the same classical training. With regard to the antitheses, he is poor on divorce, while being rich, wise and deep on talion and its relation to ancient legal theory. His treatment of oaths rightly expands it into a discussion of the problem of language (cf. *logos*, 5,37), and brings Plato's *Phaedrus* and *Cratylus* into the discussion, besides Aristotle, Philo, Plutarch and Lucian.

Methodologically B. is trying to reconstruct the presuppositions underlying a condensed text. This is good and necessary but involves some speculation, which he criticizes in others while often practicing it himself. Indeed, B.'s use of ancient philosophy helps to overcome the view, advocated by disciples of Karl Barth if not by the master himself, that there is such a chasm between the Bible and human reason, between the Greek and Semitic minds, between nature and grace, that no dialogue is possible

⁽¹¹⁾ A. MOMIGLIANO, *Alien Wisdom* (Cambridge 1975).

⁽¹²⁾ *The Mind of Mark* (Rome 1969).

⁽¹³⁾ Cf. the evolution of Davies-Allison from rejection of Mosaic typology in 1963 to embrace of it in 1993, D.C. ALLISON, *The New Moses. A Matthean Typology* (Minneapolis 1993).

or pertinent. To be sure, there are differences, but there are also stepping stones from each side which can make the leap of faith not too difficult for the healthy mind aided by grace. On the other hand, B. avoids mentioning modern philosophy except in his outstanding treatment of the Golden Rule (508-519), perhaps the most important contribution of the book.

B.'s Hellenism begins to run wild when he interprets (583) the *skirtesate* ("leap for joy") of Luke 6,23 as the satyrs' dance in the Dionysus cult. On Luke 6,40, after an excursus on rules for teachers and students, B. provides a philologically thorough commentary (622-626) which is both interesting and flattening (since it turns the verse into a statement of general education experience), and thus shows the strength and weakness of the whole work. The verse is the basis for B.'s major thesis that the SP has an educational function, like Plutarch's *De liberis educandis*. Any accents specific to Jesus or his movement are lost.

Because of his relative lack of interest in the OT, B. has not noticed that Matt 5,14-16 may have been loosely inspired by some of the imagery in three of the night visions of LXX Zech 4 and 5. Common vocabulary includes *luchnon*, *luchnia*, *horos*, *oikos/oikia*, and, what would be decisive, *modion* = *metron* (Heb. *ephah*). This however is a mere possibility. Given his interest in ancient law, B. might have been interested in the Roman legal principle *favorabilia amplianda, arctiora restringenda* (permissive laws are to be interpreted to apply to as many people as possible, restrictive laws are to apply to as few people as possible) and its echo in early Jewish law which states that in civil cases the magistrates should proceed with haste, while in capital criminal cases they should take their time⁽⁴⁾. These principles could help in the more humane interpretation of Matt 5,28, as does his second citation of Philo (235).

Unlike many other commentators, B. takes chaps. 6 and 7 of the SM as seriously as chap. 5. Yet neither he nor other commentators, so far as I can see, have noticed the simple fact that the first three petitions of the Lord's Prayer are all saying the same thing, they are essentially the same petition, viz., that the Lord manifest his power in the world as creator and redeemer, to bring in the fulness of his blessing. But this one and the same prayer is expressed three times, each time in a different biblical idiom. The first time it is expressed in the prophetic idiom of Ezekiel and Isaiah, the prayer for the sanctification of the divine name. The second time in terms of Danielic apocalyptic, the prayer for the coming of the kingdom of God in its fullness (which became of course the characteristic of the Matthean Jesus). The third time it is expressed in terms of sapiential literature, as a prayer that God's will be done on earth as it is in heaven. All three stand in

⁽⁴⁾ The Jewish basis is found in the discussion of four legal cases which had been grouped together in Philo, *Life of Moses*, II, 192-245. It is found repeated four times in both Tg Neofiti and in Tg Ps-Jon when the four cases occur: Lev 24,12; Num 9,8; 15,34; 27,5. The targumic distinction between cases of money and cases of life corresponds roughly to the modern distinction between civil and criminal cases. The distinction between prompt and slow decisions corresponds roughly to the Roman distinction between concessive and restrictive laws. In biblical and Jewish law, adultery was a capital offence, thus the restrictive rules apply.

a relationship of synonymous parallelism to one another. The final clause ("on earth as it is in heaven") applies to all three stichs, so that the prayer requests that the state of affairs which already exists in heaven may soon be realized on earth. A triple parallelism is uncommon, but here is easily explained if one assumes, as is usually done, that the longer Matthean recension is a liturgical expansion of the shorter form found in Luke 11,2. There one finds only the first two of Matthew's three petitions. In Matthew the first petition has been pushed out of parallelism into a relation with the first Lucan word, *pater*, which itself has been expanded to "Our father who art in heaven". One may also compare Dupont's analysis of the first three Lucan beatitudes which are all addressed to exactly the same group of people, the poor who are hungry and weep because they are poor (cf. Betz, 378-379)⁽¹⁵⁾. On the bread petition, B.'s remarks (400) on the quantity requested, only what is needed for one day at a time, are correct, but fail to catch the allusion to the daily gift of manna (Exod 16; 2 Cor 8,15-16) and its rule against hoarding. His remarks on the concluding doxology (414-415), while textcritically sound, completely miss its appropriateness, because he has not seen that the central point of the prayer is the petition for the kingdom, consonant with Jesus' preaching in both Q and Mark. Thus the doxology functions as a return of the prayer to its central petition, as a rounding off.

The commentary ends abruptly, without a conclusion. Such is provided by several recent articles with which B. has accompanied the big book⁽¹⁶⁾.

In the end, one suspects that for B., there exists somewhere in his religious heart an enchanted garden where Jesus and Paul lie above criticism, untouched by all this human learning. He can afford to write calmly here because his faith is elsewhere. This is the romantic temptation of Franz Overbeck, R.H. Lighfoot and Bultmann himself. B. has a certain delight in the SM as a piece of Hellenistic Jewish literature but not as a part of Christian faith⁽¹⁷⁾. One will always consult this commentary gladly for its patient accumulation of an immense learning. But one will also be aware of its peculiar limitations.

University of Fribourg
CH-1700 Fribourg

Benedict T. VIVIANO, O.P.

⁽¹⁵⁾ The connection, without the reference to the different parts of canon, was seen by B. GERHARDSSON, *The Shema in the New Testament* (Lund 1996) 86-91, and taken up by D. HAGNER, *Matthew* (WBC 33; Dallas 1993).

⁽¹⁶⁾ These articles are listed in the bibliography of the book.

⁽¹⁷⁾ One should especially note B.'s article, "Wellhausen's Dictum 'Jesus was not a Christian, but a Jew' in the Light of Present Scholarship", *ST* 45 (1991) 83-108.

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

Ferdinand AHUIS, *Exodus 11,1–13,16 und die Bedeutung der Trägergruppen für das Verständnis des Passa* (FRLANT 168). Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996. 126 p. 15,5 × 23. DM 54,—

Das anzuzeigende Buch ist die Frucht eines Seminars über die Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuchs, das seit 1991 kontinuierlich am Fachbereich Ev. Theologie der Universität Hamburg stattfindet. Es baut auf früheren Arbeiten des Verf. zu Pentateuchthemen auf: *Der klagende Gerichtsprphet* (Stuttgart 1982) und *Autorität im Umbruch* (Stuttgart 1983).

In der Pentateuchdiskussion sucht F. Ahuis einen Mittelweg zwischen der neueren Urkundenhypothese und dem Modell von R. Rendtorff und E. Blum. So rechnet er auf der einen Seite mit den Quellen Jahwist und Priesterschrift, auf der anderen Seite nimmt er eine umfangreiche dtr Redaktion des Tetrateuchs an.

Das Anliegen der vorliegenden Arbeit ist es, den Weg der Passaüberlieferung von der ältesten mündlichen Stufe bis zum vorliegenden Textbestand zu rekonstruieren und auf jeder Stufe zu fragen, auf welche Weise die jeweilige Trägergruppe den Überlieferungsprozeß und die Überlieferung selbst beeinflußt hat.

Nach der Darstellung zweier "gegensätzlicher Stimmen aus der neueren Forschungsgeschichte" (13-26), W.H. Schmidt und R. Albertz, betrachtet F. Ahuis zunächst den Textkomplex Ex 11,1–13,16 als Ganzen (28-32), um anschließend die priesterschriftliche (33-43) und die jahwistische Passaüberlieferung (44-66) sowie die dtr Redaktion des Tetrateuch im genannten Textbereich zu analysieren (67-80). Eine Zusammenfassung (81-83), Literatur-, Stellen- und Stichwortverzeichnis (84-101) sowie eine deutsche und hebräische Synopse des untersuchten Textbestandes (102-126) schließen den Band ab.

Nach F. Ahuis stellt sich die Überlieferungsgeschichte des Passa folgendermaßen dar: Zu Beginn steht ein nomadischer Familienritus im Zusammenhang des Weidewechsels. Er hat apotropäische Funktion: Indem der pater familias ein Lamm schlachtet und mit dessen Blut die Tiere und die Familienangehörige bestreicht, soll dem im verheerenden Ostwind wirkenden Dämon (*mašhūt*) gewehrt werden. Der Jahwist, hinter dem F. Ahuis einen landjüdischen Sippenältesten zur Zeit Salomos vermutet, überträgt den Familienritus Passa auf die Sippe (Ex 12,21), also einen weitaus größeren Personenkreis. Der Sippenälteste schlachtet das Kleinvieh und bestreicht mit dem Blut Schwelle und Türpfosten der Häuser. Dadurch, daß der Verheerer mit JHWH identifiziert wird, wird der Ritus in die

JHWH-Religion integriert. Durch den Ritus empfangen die Häuser ein Bewahrungszeichen, das Gericht betrifft allein die Ägypter, die F. Ahuis transparent auf Salomo gezeichnet empfindet. Der Exodus, in dessen Kontext bei J vom Passa die Rede ist, ist ein sozialer "Exodus aus der Umklammerung des Königs" (78). Die Priesterschrift, als deren Trägergruppe Priester gegen Ende des babylonischen Exils angenommen werden, greift nomadische Tradition auf. Das Passa wird hier wieder zum Familienfest, das auf den Exodus aus der Gefangenschaft hinweist. Nach Ex 12,4.28 haben die Familienväter wieder die leitende Funktion. Die Überlieferung des Jahwisten und der dtn Gesetzgebung (Dtn 16) wird aufgenommen und umgeformt. Unmittelbar nach dem Exil waren die dtr Bearbeiter des Tetrateuch wirksam. F. Ahuis sieht in ihnen Leviten in Juda und Jerusalem. Wie die Priesterschrift haben sie ältere Überlieferung, levitische *da'at* und *tôrâ*, in die Passatexte eingefügt (z.B. Ex 12, 3aα.6-8), und zu ihren Hauptanliegen zählt die Integration der ganzen Gemeinde ins Festgeschehen. Schließlich vollzieht erst die dtr Redaktion, die J und P zusammenarbeitet, die Verknüpfung von Passa- und Mazzotfest.

Die Kritik des vorgelegten Versuches betrifft vor allem zwei Punkte: 1. die Literarkritik bzw. die literarische Zuordnung der Schichten; 2. die Bestimmung der Trägergruppen.

1. F. Ahuis ermittelt in Ex 12 neben einer P-Grundlage eine breite dtr Redaktionsschicht. Sie umfaßt Ex 12,3*.6b-8.12-20.23*-27.34-36.39.42-51 (dazu 13,1-16). M.E. geht diese Zuweisung zu weit. Vor allem fehlen sichere Kriterien für eine Qualifizierung von 12,6-8.12-20 und 43-51 als dtr. Ich habe in meiner Dissertation *Exil und Identität* (Frankfurt 1992) die Überarbeitung der P^G-Grundlage, die sehr anders aussieht als die Rekonstruktion bei F. Ahuis, als sekundär priesterschriftlich (P^S) bestimmt, und vor allem wegen des eng auf P^G bezogenen Inhalts der Überarbeitung erscheint mir diese Zuweisung nach wie vor als plausibel. Vor allem der Widerspruch, der sich zwischen Ex 12,8 und Dtn 16,7 ergibt — soll das Fleisch gebraten oder gekocht werden? —, scheint mit nicht geeignet, beide Texte derselben dtn/dtr Tradition zuzuschreiben. Für Ex 12,15-20 weist vor allem das Vokabular auf P, während Vv.43-51 sich mit ihrem Rekurs auf die Beschneidung als von P beeinflusst zu erkennen geben. Endlich ist die Form der Texte viel eher priesterschriftlich als dtr, so daß man weiterhin zwar Ex 12,24-27; 13,1-16 als dtr ansprechen sollte, viel mehr aber nicht. Zwar setzt DtrT nach F. Ahuis J und P voraus, so daß ihm auch Vokabular und Theologie der Priesterschrift geläufig ist, doch muß man m.E. fragen, ob eine Benennung dieser (End-?) Redaktionsschicht als dtr noch sinnvoll ist. Muß man nicht, um dem Verfahren auf dem Weg zur Endredaktion genauer auf die Spur zu kommen, hier stärker zu differenzieren versuchen, so daß eine Unterscheidung zwischen sekundären priesterschriftlichen und sekundären dtr Redaktionen sinnvoll bleibt?

2. Die Frage nach den hinter der biblischen Überlieferung stehenden Trägergruppen, die seit dem Aufkommen der klassischen Formgeschichte in der Wissenschaft virulent ist, ist ohne Zweifel eine berechtigte Frage. Es wäre sehr zu begrüßen, wenn die Forschung hier in absehbarer Zeit über eine Kriteriologie verfügte, die es erlaubte, mehr als Vermutungen anzustellen. Aber sind wird schon so weit?

Konkret gefragt: Was sind wirklich zwingende Argumente, in der Person des Jahwisten einen Sippenältesten (in der Zeit Salomos) zu sehen? Reicht schon die Erwähnung der Ältesten in Ex 12,21, die Nennung weiterer Ältester in Ex 3,16.18; 18,12; Num 16,25 sowie die Erwähnung ausländischer Ältester in Gen 50,7; Num 22,7 (64) für eine so weit gehende Identifikation? Zwar gibt es manche Hinweise auf ein Interesse an den Ältesten im Werk des J—z.B. ist auch der Hinweis, daß J seine Vätergeschichte als Geschichte der Sippe Terachs darstellt, nicht unwichtig; aber nochmals: Reichen diese Hinweise schon als Beleg für die These aus? Es wäre wünschenswert, wenn F. Ahuis diese These auf der Grundlage seiner gesammelten Forschungsarbeiten einmal breiter entfalten würde. Ebenso hypothetisch erscheint mir die Zuweisung der dtr Redaktion des Tetrateuch an Leviten. Zwar hat die Verbindung der dtn/dtr Predigt mit levitischen Gruppen wissenschaftsgeschichtlich eine lange und ehrenwerte Tradition, ein überzeugender Nachweis für die Verbindung ist jedoch noch nicht gelungen. Eine breitere Entfaltung der These wäre auch hier wünschenswert gewesen, aber vielleicht ist F. Ahuis nicht genügend Raum gewährt worden.

Sehr berechtigt scheint mir bei aller Kritik im einzelnen das Votum, stärker zwischen Familie und Sippe zu unterscheiden (z.B. 46-48). Sollten hier weitere Differenzierungen in der Zuweisung der Überlieferung gelingen, wäre ein wichtiger Fortschritt in der Kenntnis der sozialen Struktur des vorexilischen Israel erreicht.

Am Brink 4
D - 27446 Selsingen

Klaus GRÜNWALDT

William S. MORROW, *Scribing the Center: Organization and Redaction in Deuteronomy 14:1-17:13* (SBL Monograph Series 49). Atlanta, GA, Scholars Press, 1995, xi-271 p. 15,5 × 23. Cloth: \$49.95; paper: \$33.95

Using a combination of literary-critical and discourse analysis techniques, M. attempts to demonstrate a basic unity, at the clause level, for Deut 14,1-17,13. His investigation of literary unity in this text deals with "units of semantic cohesion called clause rows". Although these might be compared to paragraphs in English, they are not totally analogous and can merely be identified by "shared vocabulary and grammatical referents" (33). In sketching out his research methodology, he acknowledges particular influence on his study by M.A.K. Halliday and R. Hasan, *Cohesion in English* (English Language Series 4; London 1976), and W. Richter, *Exegese als Literaturwissenschaft: Entwurf einer alttestamentlichen Literaturtheorie und Methodologie* (Göttingen 1971). He also adheres to a synchronic description of textual structure as he examines both the exophoric and the endophoric context of this material. Throughout his study, M. attempts to identify literary-critical problems which can be solved at the clause level and those sequential relationships are still uncertain and must therefore be deferred for future study.

In tracing the compositional layers of Deut 14,1–17,13, M. identifies a primary layer which he calls the “*mqwm* sequence”, whose principal concern is “with actions and journeys connected to the ‘place which Yahweh your God chooses’” (13). Citing earlier texts, M. sees this sequence as a “commentary on [Deut] 12,13-19”. A literary logic then emerges, based on the clause rows, which focuses on the rights of the tribal groups entitled to land ownership, the responsibilities of priests and Levites, and to the confining of legitimate sacrifice to the divinely chosen location. This functions as a rationale for the arrangement and unity of Deuteronomy 12–18, but also demonstrates the tension with Deuteronomy 19–25, which does not follow the same literary pattern and may have been composed using the Decalogue as its organizing point.

M. explains his method and the form in which his analysis will be displayed in Chapter 3. This includes a description of the elements in the grammatical, structural cohesion of each clause row, which he calls “outer structure”. This in turn provides the basis for establishing relationships between the strings of clauses, evidencing their “communication” (i.e., inner structure). Quantifying these observations, M. provides charts displaying in abbreviated form the structural analysis of each clause, as well as an extended table in the Appendix. Identification of parallels and stereotypical, deuteronomistic language also aids this analysis and employs the compiled list of linguistic jargon found in M. Weinfeld’s *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford 1972). In so doing, M. argues that deuteronomistic is a literary, not a historical phenomenon (see 50-51).

Chapters 4–5, which contain the bulk of this volume (57-208), lay out M.’s clause row analysis and argue for their literary unity. This section consists of a line by line, phrase by phrase literary analysis of each clause row. Literary analogues, structural parallels, and linguistic affinities are discussed at great length and in a fairly technical manner, which presupposes both a knowledge of the Hebrew text and grammar as well as an understanding of the use of syntactical analysis.

One typical example of this style of analysis is found in his treatment of Deut 15,7-11 and its prohibition against ignoring the financial plight of the poor (102-110). M. first provides a transcription and translation, coupled with a chart noting the structural characteristics of the text. Specific syntactical elements that do not comprise clause constituents (the protasis phrase *m’hd ’hyk* in 15,7a) are briefly discussed, and then the clause row structure is described in more detail. Formulaic word pairs are noted, the appearance of quotation, repetition, and inclusion all comprise elements of inner structure which he then charts for clarity.

Parallels and typical stylistic patterns are then discussed (If-You instruction, casuistic law, prohibition) along with Dtn phrases. Motivation for the inclusion of the reiteration in v.11 is discussed, because of its seeming lack of unity, with the previous verses. After discussing a variety of views, M. concludes that vv.7-10 form a ring composition, and v.11 has most likely been added based on “aesthetic considerations” (109).

Close reading of the text in this manner and careful analysis of literary aspects of the clause rows certainly do provide a clearer sense of the

compositional style of the writers. It suggests an extremely judicious and artful use of the language by professional scribes whose job was not only to record, but to truly compose.

In his final chapter, M. concludes that the "primary literary layer of Deut 14,1-17,13 is found in the *mqwm* sequence" (209). His purpose here is to identify those portions of the text which do not fit the *mqwm* sequence and to disprove the idea that this sequence is dependent on a single pre-Dtn source belonging to the *Privilegrecht* tradition. Those clause rows which he identifies as not part of this sequence are 14,1-21; 15,7-18; 16,21-17,7. Their structure and style of composition suggest an origin in either oral contexts or serve as commentary on other legal texts.

Among the categories of law which he discusses in this section is the festival laws (including Deut 14,22; 15,19). In terms of the *mqwm* sequence, he notes that the festival laws are most likely based on at least three circulating traditions, which were eventually compiled and edited into their current form by the Dtn writer (216). This seems a plausible conclusion, but one that is difficult to prove. His analysis of the relationship of Deut 16,19 to *Privilegrecht* traditions (218) does throw more light on the eventual form of the text, however.

Finally, M. tries to sketch a redactional history of this portion of Deuteronomy. He is cautious about this and insists that there are sufficient gaps in the diachronic relationships to prevent a complete analysis. M. uses the categories of P.E. Dion, "Deuteronomy and the Gentile world: A Study in Biblical Theology", *Toronto Journal of Theology* 1 (1985) 201-202. He concludes that the *mqwm* sequence dates to the Josianic reform, but it shows definite familiarity with pre-Dtn tradition, and serves as a commentary for Deut 12,13-19. Because it does not allude to or make comment on Deuteronomy 13, the *mqwm* sequence most likely predates that chapter. Some exilic additions are also noted (Deut 16,21-17,7) as well as copyists' additions.

Summing up this volume is a difficult task. It provides a wealth of information and could be used profitably as a literary-critical commentary on this portion of Deuteronomy. It serves as a primer on redactional analysis of legal materials. However, because it limits itself to redactional methods and literary-critical approach, some may come away dissatisfied. There are only occasional attempts to seek answers to questions regarding social context. The complexity of the analysis will also deter some researchers, as will the rigid adherence to a single approach to the text. While discourse analysis is becoming an increasingly important method employed by scholars examining narrative texts, its use in legal materials really requires a blending of other forms of biblical criticism. Otherwise, the conclusions and the discussion will be shared by a very limited audience.

Southwest Missouri State University
Springfield, MO 65804

Victor H. MATTHEWS

Hans Ulrich STEYMANS, *Deuteronomium 28 und die adê zur Thronfolgeregelung Asarhaddons. Segen und Fluch im Alten Orient und in Israel* (OBO 145). Freiburg Schweiz, Universitätsverlag – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995, xi-425 p. 16,5 × 23,5. SFr 125,—

Cette thèse de l'Université de Vienne reprend en profondeur la question de la dépendance de Dt 28 envers le documents de 672 av. J.-C. ("Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon", ci-après, VTE), par lequel Asarhaddon chercha à imposer Aššurbanipal comme son successeur incontesté. Steymans est amené à traiter de plusieurs sujets apparentés, tels que l'usage et la forme des malédictions et bénédictions que nous ont léguées la Bible et l'Orient, et une courte recension ne peut faire justice à toute la richesse de son ouvrage. Comme nous acceptons la plupart des positions de l'Auteur, il faudra nous pardonner de faire une plus grande place au résumé qu'à la critique.

Les fragments de VTE découverts à Nimrud en 1955 étaient destinés à la Médie; mais tous les princes de l'empire, y compris Manassé de Juda, eurent vraisemblablement à accepter les mêmes stipulations, sous peine des catastrophes évoquées par une longue série de malédictions. Wiseman avait déjà noté certaines affinités entre Dt 28 et VTE dans son édition de 1958 (*Iraq* 20, 1-99), et de nouvelles enquêtes, qui culminèrent en 1965 (Borger, Frankena, Weinfeld), firent germer l'hypothèse que Dt 28 dépendait d'un traité assyrien peu ou point différent de VTE. Plusieurs voix s'élevèrent cependant contre cette opinion et cherchèrent à expliquer les affinités des deux documents par l'influence d'une tradition foncièrement uniforme. Ce nouvel examen conclut à la dépendance des malédictions du Deutéronome envers une version de VTE, sans doute rédigée en araméen, langue diplomatique de l'ouest de l'empire, que les écrivains deutéronomiques avaient pu consulter dans les archives du royaume de Juda. Les deux principales discussions roulent sur les malédictions de VTE au sein de la tradition orientale (34-149), et sur la composition de Dt 28 (221-369).

Dans la première partie, Steymans s'étend surtout sur les malédictions que l'on compare habituellement à Dt 28, traitant tour à tour des malédictions attachées à des divinités célestes (§§ 38-43) et de celles que VTE attribue aux grands dieux en général (§§ 56; 63-65). L'Auteur examine attentivement la teneur, le sens grammatical, la valeur sémantique et le plan de chaque malédiction, mais son principal objectif est de déterminer le degré d'originalité, voire d'unicité de chacun des passages apparentés au Deutéronome. Si en effet les contacts portent sur des points où VTE innovait, la principal objection à une relation privilégiée entre les deux documents s'écroule du même coup.

Pour Steymans (52-72), la tradition est représentée en cette matière par environ deux cents textes politiques babyloniens et assyriens, s'étalant dans le temps entre le Code d'Hammurapi et VTE. Ses comparaisons révèlent l'originalité des malédictions par Anu, Shamash, Ninurta et Dilbat, qui sont soit sans parallèles, soit associées ailleurs avec d'autres dieux. Stey-

mans montre également que, surtout dans les documents destinés au Levant, la tradition n'imposait nullement la priorité de Sin sur Shamash (91), dont les malédictions se succèdent pourtant dans le même ordre en VTE et en Dt 28,27-28. Pour ce qui est des malédictions par les grands dieux, les §§ 56 et 63-65 ne ressemblent à aucun modèle plus ancien. L'examen de ces passages, et spécialement du long § 56, est crucial en ce qu'il montre la liberté avec laquelle les auteurs assyriens pouvaient ordonner entre elles des malédictions qui n'étaient rattachées à aucune divinité précise (cf. 12); en effet, pense Steymans, le plan du § 56 n'est pas commandé par la hiérarchie du panthéon, mais plutôt par la poursuite purement littéraire d'une structure concentrique (120-129). Il faut donc rejeter l'explication des ressemblances Dt 28-VTE par les impératifs d'une tradition orientale commune, et s'attendre à ce qu'en Dt 28 aussi les malédictions s'ordonnent plutôt librement.

Cette étude minutieuse du VTE fait toutefois ressortir les sérieuses différences de formulation qu'on trouve dans les parallèles deutéronomiques; est-il raisonnable de rattacher ceux-ci à des modèles si éloignés? Steymans aborde cette difficulté en évaluant le degré de libre adaptation qui se manifeste dans les textes bilingues ou traduits du Proche-Orient (150-194). Il n'étudie à cet effet que peu de textes, écrits en principe entre Hammurapi et la fin de l'empire assyrien (traité de paix entre Hatti et l'Égypte, inscriptions de Tell Fekherye et de Karatepe, traités impliquant Mati-ilu d'Arpad, etc.); mais il prolonge sa revue jusqu'à inclure l'inscription de Darius I^{er} à Bisitun et la bilingue de Sardes (KAI 260), discute de l'importance de l'araméen dans l'empire des Sargonides et mentionne plusieurs fois les changements qui interviennent dans les recensions successives des inscriptions royales néo-assyriennes. À travers cette documentation, il relève la fréquence des expansions d'énumérations, les échanges entre métaphores et expressions plus abstraites, la préférence ouest-sémitique pour les «futility curses» (excursus, 181-185), et les changements de noms divins; d'après lui, les auteurs de Dt 28 étaient libres de modifier leur modèle présumé de toutes ces manières, d'autant plus qu'ils ne visaient pas proprement à traduire et ne tenaient pas spécialement à ce qu'on reconnût leur source (150).

On voit que la documentation envisagée n'est pas rigide ment délimitée; on pourrait donc souhaiter qu'y soient ajoutés, p.ex., la trilingue de Xanthos, qui se termine par des malédictions, ou le traité entre Hannibal et Philippe V de Macédoine, dont la formulation grecque conservée par Polybe (VII,9) dépend d'un original punique; mais ces témoins ne changeraient rien d'essentiel. Plus grave est le problème posé par le degré de divergence entre Dt 28 et VTE. Même si aucune de leurs différences n'est sans exemple quant à sa nature même, l'éloignement global qui en résulte est peu commun, et nous empêche de partager toute la certitude de Steymans sur le fait que Dt 28 dépende précisément du document de 672 av. J.-C.

Steymans se tourne ensuite vers les malédictions deutéronomiques elles-mêmes (195-369). Prenant pour acquises les vues de N. Lohfink sur l'historicité de la réforme de Josias et sur une première forme, pré-exilique, de l'Histoire Deutéronomiste, il replace Dt 28 dans son cadre (avec attention spéciale au chapitre 27), étudie chacune de ses principales divisions sous les mêmes angles que les paragraphes de VTE (en ajoutant la *Literarkritik* et

en s'arrêtant surtout aux vv. 20-44 [239-312]) et esquisse une théorie complète sur la genèse de ce chapitre (377-383).

Dans l'économie actuelle du livre, Dt 28 est introduit par 26,16-19 et conclu par les rites de 29-30 (avant tout, 29,9-14). 28,1 retourne à la grande scène des plaines de Moab après la digression sur Sichem (chapitre 27); et 28,69 fait le pont entre les lois, les bénédictions-malédiction, et la cérémonie d'alliance. De même qu'en VTE, les malédiction sont des souhaits de malheur conditionnels qui, tout comme les stipulations, affectent l'engagement rituel du peuple (le « passage » symbolique de 29,11).

Le noyau primitif est représenté par les vv. 20-44, dont la forme répond au mieux aux malédiction bibliques et à celles des documents officiels orientaux. L'analyse interne de cette section, et sa comparaison avec VTE, préparée per la première partie de la thèse, jouent ici un rôle crucial. Steymans reconnaît quelques additions subies par 28,20-44 (p. ex. 25b et 36-37); mais au cœur de la partie originale il trouve une structure concentrique (affection cutanée – confusion mentale – spoliation – spoliation – confusion mentale – affection cutanée; vv. 27-35), où s'insèrent d'autres éléments, tels qu'un bloc de *futility curses* et autres malédiction antithétiques (au milieu, vv. 30-32). La forme souhait (yiqtol-x) et la corrélation avec les bénédictions se rencontrent de part et d'autre de la structure concentrique, surtout avant le v. 27; cette structure est suivie d'un second groupe de *futility curses* et malédiction antithétiques (vv. 38-44).

Cette composition s'inspire de VTE avec la liberté qu'on trouve généralement dans les textes bilingues du Proche-Orient. L'ordre des thèmes de malédiction vient essentiellement de VTE §56, et des extraits des §§38A-42 et 63-64 sont insérés aux endroits appropriés. Mais la structure concentrique est différente et plus restreinte en Dt 28 qu'en VTE §56, où elle commandait tout le texte; l'auteur biblique n'avait que faire, par exemple, de la paire revenants – démons qui ouvre et ferme son modèle assyrien. Il y aurait ici quelque chose d'intéressant à exploiter au sujet de la « sécularisation » accompagnant le sévère monothéisme deutéronomique; on rapprochera le phénomène signalé par Steymans de l'absence du motif « démons » en Dt 12,15-27, par contraste avec Lv 17,7.

Selon Steymans, le Deutéronome ne retint de VTE que des malédiction par les divinités célestes, avant tout Shamash, ou par les grands dieux en général. Soit toutes seules, soit avec le v. 15, et peut-être aussi 1-2a.3-6.16-19, ces malédiction des vv. (20-44)* s'articulaient sur les lois et formaient avec elles le livre découvert dans le temple sous Josias.

À un second stade toujours pré-exilique, le Deutéronome et l'histoire de Josué furent amalgamés en un « livre de la conquête »; le Deutéronome devint alors un discours de Moïse en Moab, ce qui entraîna la composition de 26,16-19; 27,1.9-10; 28,69; et 29,1-20. Les bénédictions des vv. 7-13 (dont les formules deutéronomiques sont indissociables) et la « formule de la conquête » en 21b, furent ajoutées au noyau du chapitre 28; c'est alors qu'on aura inséré les vv. 3-6.16-19 et les introductions que sont les vv. 1-2 et 15, si ces parties n'existaient déjà.

Durant l'exil Jérémie devint pour les deutéronomistes le modèle même du prophète. Les vv. 45-57.62-68, composés à cette époque, sont caractérisés

par des échos jérémien (surtout vv. 49-57; Steymans renvoie à une thèse inédite de W.A. Sumner) et par l'importance de l'Égypte. Contrairement aux vv. 16-44, ce prolongement du chapitre est plutôt une prophétie *ex eventu* qu'une suite de « malédiction » proprement dites.

Les vv. 58-61 seraient plus récents, et même post-exiliques. Steymans s'appuie sur leur caractère poétique, la mention de la torah, l'équation de YHWH avec son Nom redoutable, l'absence de transitions bien calculées telles que les vv. 45-46 et 62-63, et un vocabulaire de la maladie autre que celui des vv. 20-44. Cette addition avait pour but de pousser à l'observance de la torah au sein de la Diaspora.

La longueur de notre analyse est due en partie à la complexité et à l'aridité de cette longue thèse de doctorat. Le livre se présente bien, et nous n'y avons relevé qu'une quarantaine de coquilles; attention cependant à la p. 374, n. 5, *amoritischen*, pour *ammonitischen*, à propos de Tell Siran, un indice parmi d'autres que l'Auteur est moins familier avec l'épigraphie ouest-sémitique qu'avec l'akkadien. Au moment de publier Steymans aurait mieux servi ses lecteurs en se limitant à ce qui éclairait vraiment les relations Dt 28-VTE. Beaucoup de remarques sur le vocabulaire, les formes grammaticales, les divinités concernées, devraient être supposées connues dans une étude de ce niveau, et nous comprenons mal, par exemple, l'attention donnée au leçons du texte samaritain.

Malgré la validité fondamentale de ses conclusions, Steymans a parfois voulu trop prouver. Ainsi en est-il d'une de ses intuitions les plus originales, la préférence de l'adaptateur deutéronomique pour les divinités célestes. Si l'adaptateur ne retenait que le contenu des malédiction sans les divinités associées, que lui importait quels dieux garantissaient originellement chacune de ces menaces? Steymans ne démontre-t-il pas lui-même la souplesse des relations entre divinités et malédiction, qui marquait déjà les documents assyriens? Plus concrètement, malgré de subtiles explications (106-108), on s'étonne que la malédiction par la planète Jupiter (VTE § 43) ne soit pas reflétée en Dt 28; et on peut se demander si l'identité avec un corps céleste (Sirius) dominait l'idée qu'un Judéen instruit pouvait se faire de Ninurta (VTE § 41); cf. Gn 10,8-9, où Ninurta se cache sans doute sous le nom de Nemrod.

Un autre opinion qui revient souvent chez Steymans (p. ex., p. 193) est la probabilité que les chancelleries ouest-sémitiques du premier millénaire n'aient pas eu de scribes cunéiformes, et que des documents tels que VTE y aient été connus au moyen de traductions araméennes. On peut en douter, si l'on pense aux textes cunéiformes de Hama, qui contiennent une lettre d'affaires entre gouvernants soumis à l'Assyrie (cf. S. Parpola, dans P.J. Riis - M.-L. Buhl, *Hama II.2* [Copenhague 1990] 257-265).

Au sujet de la structure concentrique de VTE § 56, nous ne partageons pas non plus la certitude de Steymans (119-120; 311). Ses longues explications ne sont pas toutes convaincantes, spécialement dans le cas de l'obscurité et de la chaleur oppressante (lignes 477-479), censées correspondre avec les aliments et vêtements repoussants des lignes 490-491. Ailleurs aussi, nous trouvons peu convaincantes les considérations médicales utilisées pour rattacher aux privations d'un siège, et par là à la guerre, les malheurs dé-

crits par Dt 28,28 (277); ou la démonstration du caractère poétique de Dt 28,58-61 (328-329).

University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A1

Paul-Eugène DION

Marvin A. SWEENEY, *Isaiah 1-39 with an Introduction to Prophetic Literature* (FOTL 16). Grand Rapids, MI, W.B. Eerdmans, 1996. xx-547 p. 15,5 × 23. \$45.00 – £ 32.99

This introduction to prophetic literature and commentary on Isaiah 1-39 pursues a consistently form-critical approach, not only for individual texts, but for the whole of the book of Isaiah and sub-parts of Isaiah 1-39. As such, the volume follows the basic plan of the Forms of Old Testament Literature series (FOTL) of which it is a part. Each discussion of a pericope or larger unit includes a structural outline of the passage, discussion of its overall genre and of genres included in it, survey of the setting of the passage and various earlier forms of it, review of the intention of the passage and its earlier stages, and bibliography related to the preceding discussion. The volume as a whole begins with a helpful overview of genres in prophetic literature and ends with a glossary giving definition and (often) bibliography for the genres mentioned in both the introduction to prophetic literature and detailed discussion of forms throughout Isaiah 1-39. In addition, the introductory chapters of the volume feature extensive bibliography on form-critical study of prophetic literature in general and of Isaiah in particular.

Already in his introduction to prophetic literature, S. indicates his intent to focus not only on the individual units often studied by early form-critics, but also on larger wholes such as prophetic books. He then begins to execute this method in his introduction to the book of Isaiah. Following studies by Brownlee, Evans and Gosse, S. argues that the book's structure is dominated by a division between Isaiah 1-34 and 35-66. The first half anticipates God's punishment of both Jerusalem and its enemies while predicting the restoration of Zion. The second half follows a similar outline, but now looks back on the punishment of Jerusalem's enemies and proclaims the impending fulfillment of the earlier promises of restoration. The overall genre of the book is that of exhortation. Although the bulk of the material in the book is either prophetic announcement or prophetic instruction, S. argues that the strategic placement of exhortations in Isaiah 1 and 55 have turned the rest of the prophetic book into a justification of those calls for repentance.

Next S. turns to "setting". At this point S. lays out his theory regarding the four major stages of composition of the book. As he does throughout the commentary, S. starts from the present form of the book and works backward to earlier pre-stages. According to him, the final form of the book was probably composed in the temple for reading at the feast

of Sukkot and more particularly to support the reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah. This form in turn was a revision of a sixth-century edition of the book, likewise composed to function as part of the temple liturgy for the Sukkot festival, but this time centered on celebrating the rebuilding of the Second temple. This sixth century edition of Isaiah in turn built on an earlier seventh-century edition of the book. This edition was composed to support Josiah's reform and probably functioned as part of the temple liturgy for either Passover or (more likely) Sukkot. Finally, the Josianic edition of Isaiah used earlier collections of Isaianic material, such as an earlier form of the autographical material in 6,1-9,6* and portions of material now found in Isaiah 5-10; 14* and 28-32. This fourfold setting of the book then leads to S.'s fourfold description of the book's intent. S. argues that the fifth- and sixth-century editions of the book were both intended to motivate cooperation with different stages of the restoration in post-exilic Judah, while the seventh-century edition was intended to support Josiah's reform and the Isaiah materials were designated primarily to discourage foreign alliances. In each case, these "editions" represent layers of additions made around a given time, as is evident at points later in the commentary where S. discusses multiple additions within one layer (e.g. 13,2-22 and 14,1-2 on p. 234).

Thus having given the basic framework for his commentary, S. proceeds to a detailed study of the structure, genre, setting and intention of larger sections and smaller sub-units of Isaiah 1-39. His starting point in each case is a larger sub-unit as defined in his macrostructure of Isaiah. For example, one of the larger units defined in his macrostructure covers Isa 28,1-33,24 and is labeled "Prophetic instruction concerning YHWH's plan/purpose for Jerusalem: Announcement of a royal savior". When he comes to this unit in his commentary, he begins by discussing the structure, genre, setting and intention of the unit as a whole. This overall discussion of Isa 28,1-33,24 then introduces S.'s specific discussion of the structure, genre, setting and intention of what he sees to be the major sub-units of Isa 28,1-33,24: 28,1-29; 29,1-24; 30,1-33; 31,1-9; 32,1-20; and 33,1-24.

It is difficult to do justice to a work of this detail and scope within the confines of a single review. The book reflects over a decade of concentrated research by S. on the book of Isaiah, beginning with S.'s form-critical study of Isaiah (*Isaiah 1-4 and the Post-Exilic Understanding of the Isaianic Tradition* [BZAW 171; Berlin and New York 1988]) and continuing with his reviews of numerous books on Isaiah, his authorship of many articles regarding various parts of Isaiah, and his co-founding and co-chairing of program units in the Society of Biblical Literature focusing on the composition of the book of Isaiah. His command of the literature is impressive, even as he generally avoids detailed engagement with those whom he disagrees. Throughout he has a confident authorial voice, decisively assigning every verse in Isaiah 1-39 to one of his four reductional layers and often quite quickly dispatching those other perspectives that he does mention (for examples see pp. 417 and 444-445). The overall result is a bold, well-informed, and often original perspective on the forms and formation of Isaiah as a whole and specific texts in Isaiah 1-39.

The structure diagrams reflect the flux of the discipline. Almost all headings include some kind of genre elements, but many focus as well on how units relate to each other and/or quote (bottom of p. 121) or paraphrase (123) the content of the passage in question. Furthermore, the headings sometimes shift as the same unit is covered in larger and smaller diagrams. For example, S. moves from labeling Isa 7,1-25 as "Concerning house of David" on p. 113 to labeling it "Concerning Ahaz: dialogue report" in a more detailed diagram on p. 143. The most interesting insights for this reader came in S.'s observations of the systematic inter-relationships between units. Yet it is still an open question whether all prophetic passages actually follow a hierarchically defined format of the sort presupposed by the FOTL outline framework. In particular, the uncertainties multiply as the scope of the structure broadens. For example, one of the many contributions of this commentary is the way it presents the most thorough case yet for seeing parallel themes in Isaiah 1-33 and 34-66. Yet one significant problem with defining the entire structure of the book according to this observation is the lack of a clear mark of segmentation between Isaiah 33 and 34. Instead, both ancient and modern readers have been more struck with Isaiah 40 as a dividing line in the book (see D.M. Carr, "Isaiah 40:1-11 in the Context of the Macrostructure of Second Isaiah", *Discourse Analysis of Biblical Literature: What It Is and What It Offers* ed. W. Bodine [Semeia Studies; Atlanta 1995] 52). Alternatively, following S.'s own definition of the book as an exhortation on the basis of the strategic role of exhortations in Isaiah 1 and 55 (50), one could take the primary divide in the book to be between Isaiah 1-54 (governed by the exhortation in Isaiah 1) and Isaiah 55-66 (governed by the exhortation in Isaiah 55). In sum, although many helpful insights come from looking for macrostructural patterns in the book as a whole, no one pattern appears to be dominant in it.

Sweeney's discussions of genre represent the state of the art for prophetic literature in general and Isaiah in particular. Nevertheless, here again the field is in flux. S. rightly points out at the outset that no text is completely determined by its genre (14). Rather an author uses various typical generic elements as compositional tools to accomplish his or her specific ends. Yet S.'s discussions rarely explore in detail the tension between typical elements in a text and their adaptation to serve particular ends. Instead, his discussions generally juxtapose structures of texts in Isaiah with attachment of various genre labels to them and their sub-parts. There is a lot of potential, however, for exploration of such tension on the basis of S.'s work. For example, S. posits a liturgical setting for the overall book. At the same time, in his structural discussions he shows how chapters 1-33 look forward to punishment of and deliverance from enemies, while 34-66 look back on that. This shift in perspective across Isaiah's own individual structure corresponds remarkably well to the typical shift in Psalms of lament from prospective deliverance from enemies to retrospective thanksgiving for such deliverance. Thus, if S. is correct that the book was edited to function in a liturgical context, the pattern dividing 1-33 from 34-66 might point to the subtle influence of liturgical genres on its final redaction.

Sweeney's own discussions of setting tend to focus far more on the specific historical settings of successive redactions of texts in Isaiah than on the institutional or ideological settings of the forms that are present in those texts. Many of his suggestions regarding both types of setting are original and persuasive. In particular, as a Jewish scholar, S. has a refreshing sensitivity to the possible location of parts of Isaiah in various liturgical contexts of the Jewish year. At the same time, this reviewer found many of his proposals highly speculative and his discussion insufficiently explicit about the level of uncertainty that is inevitably involved in reconstruction of the formation and setting of ancient texts. For example, S. argues that the unit extending from 11,1 to 12,6 was all written as part of the Josianic edition of the book of Isaiah. Moreover, given the links to the Exodus tradition in 11,10-16 and the liturgical character of 12,1-6, S. argues that "this passage may well have played a role in Josiah's Passover celebration" (205). Yet S. is quite isolated vis-à-vis other critical scholars in maintaining single authorship of this stretch of text, and the data supporting dating of it in the seventh century or linkage of it to Passover is oblique and multivalent. To be sure, S. is somewhat cautious in his location of the text in relation to the Passover liturgy. Nevertheless, he focuses so exclusively on his own hypothesis regarding the formation and seventh-century setting of this block that the hypothetical character of his suppositions is easily missed, particularly if this commentary is to be used by people unfamiliar with the secondary literature on Isaiah, such as the students and pastors who are among the intended readers of the FOTL series (cf. xv). Overall, S. was most persuasive to this reviewer when he was dealing with the possible setting of texts assigned by him to Isaiah. He was least persuasive in arguing for placing the final redaction of Isaiah in relation to Sukkot and Ezra's reform, or — more accurately— in relation to the highly ideological and late depiction of Ezra's reform that can be found in Ezra-Nehemiah.

S.'s discussions of intention are briefer than his discussions of setting, but are often illuminating. The biggest strength of his work here is his observation of how later reductional layers appropriated and redirected earlier materials. Unfortunately, some of his observations regarding the interpretive moves of redactors are less clear than they might have been because S. follows the same movement backward from the final form in discussion of intention that he did in discussing setting (thus following the format of the FOTL series in general). When he was reconstructing pre-stages to the final form of the text, it made sense to begin with the final form and work backward. Yet once he had established a picture of that process, S.'s observations would have been even sharper if he could have moved forward, starting with the intention of earlier stages and then proceeding to later ones.

Still, this thoughtful and meticulously produced commentary is a major achievement and a high-point in the FOTL Series. Future work on Isaiah of all kinds will benefit from Sweeney's study of the forms and formation of Isaiah 1-39.

Methodist Theological School in Ohio
3081 Columbus Pike
Delaware, OH 43015

David CARR

Novum Testamentum

Harry T. FLEDDERMANN, *Mark and Q. A Study of the Overlap Texts. With an Assessment by F. Neirynck* (BETL 122). Leuven, University Press/Uitgeverij Peeters, 1995. 16 × 24,5. BF 1800

Within the general parameters of the Two Source Theory, the problem of the relationship between Mark and Q is once more back on the critical agenda. For many, it was assumed for a long time as almost axiomatic that Mark and Q were independent of each other. However, some have recently been arguing once again that Mark may in fact have known Q (cf. above all detailed studies of individual pericopae by J. Lambrecht and D.R. Catchpole). Fleddermann's book is a notable contribution to this debate. Fleddermann seeks to provide one of the most comprehensive statements of the case for the dependence of Mark on Q by analyzing all the possible "Mark-Q overlap" passages in detail. Certainly the issue has enormous potential ramifications (e.g. in relation to many aspects of synoptic criticism, and to study of the historical Jesus) as Fleddermann himself observes (2-4).

Fleddermann's procedure is to take each of the possible overlap texts in turn. He seeks to reconstruct the Q version behind Matthew and Luke, using these two gospels alone. He then compares the reconstructed Q text with the Markan parallel and seeks to show (a) that Mark is always secondary to the Q version, (b) that at times Mark presupposes Q's redaction (QR), and (c) that all the differences between Mark and Q can be explained as Markan redaction (MkR). Fleddermann also discusses parallels in the Gospel of Thomas to many of the sayings considered here. On several occasions, he argues that Thomas shows parallels with the redactional activity of the synoptic evangelists. Hence Thomas is probably dependent on the canonical gospels and cannot be regarded as an independent witness to gospel traditions.

The book is supplemented with a detailed "Assessment" by F. Neirynck, who takes up a number of Fleddermann's arguments, at times questioning the details and some of the argumentation. In one sense, therefore, the book contains its own critical review! And indeed it is probably fair to say that several of the present reviewer's questions about the book are already anticipated in Neirynck's Assessment. In assessing Fleddermann's work, I focus here primarily on the main part of the book which deals with the relationship between Mark and Q. On the sections dealing with Thomas, I find myself in agreement on so many occasions and welcome his careful assessment of the discussion. However, on the primary question of Mark and Q, a number of issues may arise.

I take first the last part of Fleddermann's general procedure (see (c) above). It is indeed possible to show that Mark's version of any Mark-Q overlap *can* be explained as MkR. And indeed Fleddermann does as good a job as any in providing what are at times very detailed explanations of Mark's alleged procedure (though one could question some details). But

even if Mark's version is shown to be at many points characteristically Markan, what does that show? On its own it can hardly show Mark's dependence on *Q*. The possibility of Mark's use of an independent, but overlapping, tradition, cannot be excluded by this argument. At times, Fleddermann almost seems to assume that there must be literary dependence and the question is hence only whether Mark depends on *Q* or *Q* on Mark. Thus in outlining his method of seeking to show dependence by showing Mark's version to be MkR, he mentions a counter-possibility: "If *Q* should prove to be dependent on Mark, it should be possible to account for the *Q* redaction of the prior text" (21), almost as if this were the only viable alternative to his own theory. Similar is his presentation of two possibilities: "Given *Q* we can easily explain why Mark would have omitted the sections [of the Beelzebul pericope]. Given Mark it is difficult to explain *Q* ..." (60). But are these the only two alternatives?!

In seeking to show there is literary dependence, Fleddermann also regularly appeals to "tradition history" to argue that *Q* is uniformly the earlier form of the tradition and Mark the later (cf. (a) above). Such appeals are of course notoriously ambiguous. In any case, they cannot on their own establish any direct literary relationship between the texts. Fleddermann himself is fully aware of the difficulties of trying to find hard and fast laws of how the tradition developed (19-20). One can point to ways in which Fleddermann's arguments seem to use criteria in different ways. For example, on *Q* 12,10/Mark 3,28, the *Q* version is said to be a "difficult" saying (in regarding opposition to the Son of Man as forgivable); Mark's easing of it (by eliminating the reference to Jesus as Son of Man) is therefore secondary (69). Yet on *Q* 7,27/Mark 1,2, Mark's introductory phrase has a "factual error" (referring to Isaiah) where *Q*'s fits the context well: hence Mark's harder version here is deemed to be secondary (29). But then again in *Q* 13,18-19/Mark 4,30-32, *Q*'s reference to the "tree" at the end of the parable of the mustard seed is taken as a technically inaccurate exaggeration, Mark's correction (to a "shrub") being seen as an indication that Mark is secondary. Is a "harder" version secondary or primary? Is a "correct" version secondary or primary? These illustrations are not intended as point-scoring, but simply to show the difficulty of setting up criteria for distinguishing "earlier" from "later" in the history of a tradition.

Some of Fleddermann's other criteria are also questionable. He claims that, in general terms, *Q*'s version is harsher, Mark's is easier (on the instructions in the mission charge) and therefore later; exaggerations in *Q* are toned down secondarily by Mark; what is implicit in *Q* is later made explicit by Mark; Mark also focuses more explicitly on Christology etc. (209-210). But in each case, one wonders why the tradition *must* have developed in the way Fleddermann argues it did. A reverse development is in nearly all cases at least conceivable.

Undoubtedly the most significant instances in this discussion involve cases where Mark might show knowledge of *Q*'s redaction (cf. (b) above). On a number of occasions, Fleddermann argues that this is indeed the case. However, as Neirynck observes in his Assessment, Fleddermann rarely

provides much detailed justification for the claim that the element in question is specifically QR; or if he does, the argument is not always entirely convincing. In fact Fleddermann eschews virtually all attempts to trace the *literary* development of any of the Q pericopes examined. He does not adopt the now widely canvassed theory of three (or more) identifiable strata in Q. This may be defensible at the level of the document Q (cf. my discussion in *Semeia* 55 [1991] 213-222); but Fleddermann rarely offers any such analysis even at the level of individual pericopae; and at this level, some such analysis would seem to be necessary. Fleddermann appears to work with a simple model of oral tradition leading to a single unified Q (cf. Neirynck on 298-299). This makes it rather hard for Fleddermann then to argue that elements in Q are QR and that Mark knows the final redacted form of Q.

For example, Fleddermann claims that Mark "shows knowledge of redactional Q" in the mission discourse (133). Yet nowhere in his analysis of that discourse does he make any attempt to separate Q's tradition from redaction. (Cf. Neirynck on 279). In relation to Q 7,27/Mark 1,2, Fleddermann claims that the change of $\mu\omicron\upsilon$ to $\sigma\omicron\upsilon$ in the form of Mal 3,1 cited must be due to QR, since it fits the Q context where Jesus is the speaker, and not the Markan context where it is the narrator speaking; hence Mark presupposes QR (27-28, 30). But the changed pronoun scarcely fits the Q context much better than the Markan one. It is Jesus who is the speaker in Q 7,27, and nothing explicitly states that the "you" of the citation is to be referred to the "I" of the speaker citing the verse. (Q's Jesus does *not* say "as God said to me..."!) Undoubtedly a redactor has modified the text to make the pronoun refer to Jesus and not God. But whether it is the Q redactor who has done this is not so clear. In fact, the wider section in Q here (e.g. Q 7,24-28) cries out for some detailed analysis into different layers, even if different results can be claimed. A case *can* be made for Q 7,27 as being due to QR (cf. D. R. Catchpole, *The Quest for Q* [Edinburgh, 1993] 63-70). Equally a case can be made for seeing the verse as part of Q's tradition (cf. my *Q and the History of Early Christianity* [Edinburgh 1996] 129-135). But some such discussion of the wider literary context within Q is surely demanded.

At other points, Fleddermann appeals to general themes which are prominent in Q as being thereby QR. Thus the reference to "this generation" in the demand for a sign (Q 11,29-30/Mark 8,12) is deemed to be QR, partly because of the prominence of this language elsewhere as a link-term in Q (132), as well as because of the fact that it "fits naturally" in the Q context here, contrasting with the generation of the Queen of the South and the Ninevites in Q 11,31-32 (*ibid.*). So too the reference to Jesus as Son of Man in Q 12,8-9 + 10/Mark 8,38 + 3,28 fits Q's Son of Man Christology: hence the whole section in Q 12,8-10 is attributable to QR and Mark thus presupposes knowledge of QR (69-70, 151).

But again Fleddermann does not analyse the broader contexts within Q. The well-known aporia between Q 12,8 and Q 12,10, leading many to see the latter as a secondary Kommentarwort on the former (cf. H. Schürmann et al.) is not mentioned here. The parallel with Mark 8,38 is thus with what

many might regard as an earlier element in the literary history of the present Q text. Nor does Fleddermann note the widely accepted seam in terms of tradition history between Q 11,29-30 and Q 11,31-32. (A reference to "this generation" is almost certainly present already in Q 11,30: one does not *need* Q 11,31-32 to explain Mark's wording, even assuming Mark's dependence on Q.) So too there are dangers of assuming that an element which agrees with the concerns of an author must, almost *ipso facto*, be a redactional creation *de novo*. In fact many have argued that talk of "this generation" may be dominical (Neirynck on 281, referring to Catchpole, Vögtle). Such language may be characteristic of Q; but that does not make it unique to Q in the tradition. (Incidentally, it is by no means clear that the diction in Q 11,29-32 fits the Q context better than Mark's context: the contrast is not between this generation and the *generation* of the Queen of the South. The Queen of the South's *generation* does not come into the picture at all.)

Similar things could be said about the parable of the thief at night (Q 12,39-40/Mark 13,35). Fleddermann takes the whole section as a QR creation. However, many would argue that the parable (v.39) and the interpretative sayings (v.40) are clearly separable. Mark does indeed have a parallel to the latter, but it is Mark who is closer to the imagery of the original parable (cf. the reference to the "master of the house" coming) than Q's heavily interpreted Christological version (which has "the Son of Man" coming). (Hence here it is Q, rather than Mark, that is the more Christologically developed!) Once again, a more detailed analysis of the Q material itself would probably be helpful.

There are some broader issues involved in this whole discussion which are not raised by Fleddermann explicitly (cf. also I. Dunderberg, *NTS* 41 [1995] 501-511, cited in part by Neirynck [300-301]).

Fleddermann (in one way rightly) criticizes some earlier discussion of the problem for not reconstructing the Q text in question first. By contrast, as already noted, he does so in each case, on the basis of Matthew and Luke alone. Yet, if his overall theory is correct and Mark knew Q, then Mark is potentially just as valid a witness to the Q wording as Matthew or Luke. Some parts of Mark (where Matthew and/or Luke differ) could in fact be preserving Q. It is also then questionable how far one can eliminate from Q some elements where Matthew or Luke agree with Mark as secondary assimilations by the later evangelists due to influence from Mark. Fleddermann's result inadvertently threatens to subvert the very procedure which sought to establish it. In his (highly laudable) attempt to be rigorous, detailed, and not to prejudge any issues, Fleddermann reconstructs the Q wording independently of his theory, i.e. by using Matthew and Luke and *not* using Mark; but the theory of Mark's dependence on Q then calls the basis for this reconstruction radically into question.

More importantly, the theory may also call into question part of the basis on which the Two Source theory is founded, including the isolation of an identifiable group of texts called "Mark-Q overlaps" which provide the evidence for the theory of Mark's dependence on Q. Q is postulated primarily to explain the agreements between Matthew and Luke

which cannot be explained as due to dependence on Mark. Further, the “overlap” passages are usually taken to be texts where the Matthew-Luke agreements *against Mark* are sufficiently extensive and significant to demand a *non*-Markan source to explain them. Thus an “overlap” passage is only thought to be identifiable as such because of the *disagreements* between Mark and Matthew/Luke (= Q); any literary relationship between Matthew/Luke and Mark is thought to be excluded for the Matthew = Luke (i.e. Q) material. If however one postulates a theory of Mark’s dependence on Q, then one is saying that the agreement between Mark and Q is sufficiently close to allow a literary solution! But if the agreements are that close, can one also claim that the Matthew-Luke agreements are *not* due to dependence on Mark? If Mark’s dependence on Q is plausible, Matthew’s/Luke’s dependence on Mark can be scarcely less plausible, at least in general terms! (Cf. too Neirynck’s related comment [297-298] that, at times, Fleddermann’s reconstruction of Q ignores the possibility that the alleged Q wording agreeing with Mark might in fact be due to Markan influence on the text of Matthew or Luke.)

Further, it becomes debatable how far one can or should distinguish the “minor agreements” from the overlap (“major agreements”) texts. Fleddermann does so distinguish (17), but is there any justification for doing so? Why should these texts be due to Matthew’s and Luke’s dependence on Mark and not to their dependence on Q with Mark preserving Q more closely than in the other “overlap” texts? Indeed the whole of Mark could derive from Q, so that all the triple tradition agreements between Matthew and Luke are due to dependence of all three on Q. But this in turn might have unpleasant consequences for some of Fleddermann’s own argument. For if QR is identified by common elements in Q (cf. above on “Son of Man”, or “this generation”), but “Q” is now expanded to cover all the Markan material as well, then say “Q”’s diction about “this generation”, or any alleged “Q Christology” of Jesus as Son of Man, might look rather different from the same claim made on the basis of a more “traditional”. i.e. smaller, Q.

Fleddermann’s book raises many questions. Yet the author is to be warmly thanked for raising the whole issue of the relationship of Mark and Q afresh and addressing it in such a comprehensive way. If there are a number of critical issues raised by his discussion, this simply reflects the importance of the issue and the clarity and comprehensiveness of the way in which he has presented his argument.

Theology Faculty Centre
41 St Giles
Oxford OX1 3LW

Christopher TUCKETT

Brendan BYRNE, *Romans* (Sacra Pagina 6). Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1996. XIX-503 p. 16 × 23,5. \$29,95

This commentary consists of three parts: Introduction (2-36), Translation, Interpretation, Notes (37-464), and four Indices (465-503: Scripture, Ancient Writings, Authors, and Subjects). The Introduction provides a survey of recent interpretations of Romans, a discussion of why Paul wrote to the Romans, a consideration of his rhetoric task and an outline of the letter's structure. It also deals with two further issues: the letter's integrity and "Paul versus Israel".

Byrne (= B.) himself emphasizes that he preferred to give, after his translation, first the interpretation and only then the notes; in this the volume differs from the other commentaries in the series. His interpretation is meant to be a continuous commentary on the letter. B. makes use of the rhetorical approach insofar as this approach sees the letter as an instrument of persuasion. He frequently refers to the modern sociology of knowledge which pays a great deal of attention to the "symbolic universe", i.e., the world of ideas, concepts and symbols shared by Paul and his readers. In B.'s opinion, the genre of the letter to the Romans is mainly epideictic and as such is a demonstrative celebration of the values of the gospel, i.e., of what God has done in Christ inclusively that is, for Jews as well as for Gentiles. Of course, there is also the exhortation to live out the consequences of the gospel.

B.'s division of Romans is by no means revolutionary. Between the Introduction (1,1-17) and the Conclusion (15,14-16,24[27]), the body of the letter consists of a long exposition (1,18-11,36: the Inclusive Saving Power of the Gospel) and of an exhortatory part (12,1-15,13: Summons to Live according to the Gospel). The subdivisions are also quite common. Those in part one are chs. 1-4, 5-8 and 9-11; those in part two comprise chs. 12-13 and 14,1-15,13. The Roman addressees, who are called the "implied readers" in the commentary, are Gentile Christians (for most part); but, within this overall framework, in the first subdivision Paul addresses the Jews: 1,18-4,25 is "an intra-Jewish debate... which Paul allows his Gentile Christian audience in Rome to 'overhear'" (157).

After the Notes each pericope is provided with a special bibliography (select, of course; but one misses, e.g., after 8,26-30 the valuable monograph on predestination by J.M. Gundry-Volf, *Paul and Perseverance* [WUNT II,37; Tübingen 1990]). B. now and then, mostly in a "reflection" at the end of the Interpretation, gives a brief critical comparison of Paul's position with modern ideas and insights. Yet, although the "Sonderweg" proposal regarding 11,25-32 is explained, one misses a further reflection on Paul's particular vision, which is so difficult to place in today's history. Where Paul is dependent on the Old Testament (especially the quotations), as well as on traditional material, B. carefully distinguishes the original sense and the Pauline adaptation.

Without any doubt this is an excellent commentary. Its numerous qualities should be duly praised. Notwithstanding the (moderate, wise) use of rhetorical and sociological terminology, the outcome of B.'s exegesis

could be called classical. One admires the disciplined manner in which passage after passage Paul's train of thought is elucidated; we certainly have here a very close reading. The treatment is objective, prudent, honest; the style is pleasantly sober and polished; the judgments are both sensible and sensitive. The users of this commentary are in constant contact with the author's view of Paul's reasoning in Romans. B. often proposes various ways of understanding, weighs them and then offers his own choice. One greatly appreciates the cautious manner in which B. handles Paul's dealing with Israel, as well as his respect for women's concerns (and even feminist susceptibilities). Similar praise is also due to the author's ecumenical sensitivity. No theological summary or conclusion is presented at the end, but within the introductions to the main sections B.'s overall view of Romans is clearly worked out. We may quote the last, somewhat ponderous sentence: "The God who acted inclusively to bring formerly excluded Gentiles within the salvation promised to the human race through Israel will likewise act inclusively to bring that bulk of Israel presently excluded from salvation within the same inclusive scope of salvation" (463).

Sometimes one wonders whether the rendering of a Pauline expression can still be taken as a translation. So, e.g., for *κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως* in 12,6 we read "manifested according to its (= prophecy) capacity to build up faith" (367) or for *εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη* in 16,26 "that an obedience of faith be brought about with respect to all nations". The laborious translation of 7,21a is: "So this is what I find to be the case with respect to 'law'" (224); why not: "So I find that it is a law"? What follows then explains this "law". It should be admitted, however, that in the Notes B. justifies his occasionally rather free renderings. One may claim that in 3,1-8 it is not Paul but a fictional opponent who asks the questions, and that Paul, not the so-called "partner" or interlocutor, gives the answers (106-107).

Agreement with B.'s content is not always possible. Some points in the exegesis of 3,21-26 are not so clear or are less correct. To begin with, B. does not explain why he understands *μαρτυρουμένη* in v.21 concessively ("although the law and the prophets bear witness to it", 122); this nuance is hardly acceptable. Second, the term *πάρεσις* of v.25 is translated as "the passing over" (122) but also as "pardon" (123); the discussion on p.133 mentions both alternatives. However, on the same page it is stated with regard to the first (and, I think, by far the most probable) possibility that "the point is not that God left the sins unpunished but that God left them 'undealt with'"; yet on p.134 B. states that "Paul has in view the epoch when God refrained from inflicting (upon the Jews) the eschatological wrath occasioned by human sin". Is this not the omission of punishment? Third, why does B. add the parenthetical "also" in v.26: "it was (also) to display" (122)? It would seem that *εἰς ἔνδειξιν* in v.25 is repeated by *πρὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν* in v.26 in order to explain the phrase in v.25 more fully.

In the text unit 9,30-10,21, entitled "Israel's Present Rejection of the Gospel" (307-328), B. seems to avoid the term "guilt"; he repeatedly speaks of "Israel's failure": "...the chief focus lies upon the failure of

Israel. The aim is not to blame Israel — to establish Israel's 'guilt'... (308). This distinction seems forced. Perhaps in 9,30-33 the nuance of culpability or sin is not so evident; but it would seem that in 10,3 and certainly in 10,14-21 the idea of guilt cannot be explained away. Moreover, we wonder whether Paul in 10,16 really uses ὑπακούω instead of πιστεύω as a kind of "excuse for Israel" (325). The translation "not all have responded" (instead of "obeyed") is too weak.

The possibility that συσχηματίζεσθε and μεταμορφοῦσθε in 12,2 are middles with a reflexive active meaning ("do not conform yourselves but transform yourselves") is not mentioned on p. 366.

B. translates 13,11a as "In all this recognize time" (397). According to B. one must recognize "the precise significance of the present time", penetrate, as it were, "the outer shell of the old passing world... to discern the new reality that is taking shape within" (398). But is it not v. 11b that indicates the quite simple sense of 13,11a: one must know the time; that is, the hour to awake from sleep?

The typographical presentation and the binding of the book are exemplary. There are few errors, for instance, p. 53, line 12 (what is said?); p. 277, line 21 (the verb "are" is missing); and p. 439, last line (the division of 15,23 and 24 is incorrect). Perelman and Thielman are written with a single n.

Other readers may bring forward other points of criticism. I am sure, however, that most, if not all, of them will highly value this carefully argued and most readable work. The dense brevity of B.'s one volume commentary is not its least merit.

Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Rome

Jan LAMBRECHT, S.J.

Wolfgang KRAUS, *Das Volk Gottes. Zur Gründlegung der Ekklesiologie bei Paulus* (WUNT 85). Tübingen, J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1996. XII-443 p. 16 × 23,5. DM 148,—

Es sabido que la eclesiología paulina ha girado en general en torno a la idea del Cuerpo de Cristo. Esta obra, «Habilitationsschrift» del autor, aporta básicamente la concepción de que el concepto de Pueblo de Dios es tanto o más fundamental y central que el de Cuerpo de Cristo en el pensamiento eclesiológico del Apóstol. Vaya por delante que la exposición global es convincente y que resulta un enriquecimiento muy interesante para la eclesiología paulina. (En el Concilio Vaticano II, el esquema preparatorio sobre la Iglesia también tenía como idea central la del Cuerpo de Cristo y fué modificado para tomar como eje también la de Pueblo de Dios. Naturalmente esa evolución no tuvo nada que ver con un estudio de eclesiología paulina en concreto, pero resulta curioso comprobar un cambio semejante por motivaciones y razones exegéticas prácticamente del todo diferentes, y desde otra perspectiva y ambiente muy distintos. Como he dicho la tesis en general parece bien fundada, aunque ciertos puntos concretos, algunos de ellos

importantes, sean discutibles y se puedan someter a ulteriores clarificaciones. Pero no es lo más importante entrar ahora en estos detalles. Algunos de ellos aparecerán en lo que sigue.

Es cierto que Pablo no emplea demasiado explícitamente la terminología de Pueblo de Dios para referirse a la Iglesia. En realidad lo hace sólo en dos ocasiones (Ro 9,25 y 2 Cor 6,16 y, si se quiere, Ga 6,16), aunque las dos primeras de importancia porque Pablo aplica la designación directamente a la comunidad cristiana. Por ello ha de atenderse al resto de la semántica eclesiológica paulina para ver las posibles referencias, implícitas pero importantes, y la concepción de Pueblo de Dios que se da en ellas (111-119). Efectivamente es conveniente caer en la cuenta de que en términos como «ekklesia», «santos», «llamados» o «escogidos» y otros hay resonancias de la concepción veterotestamentaria de Pueblo de Dios, aplicadas a la comunidad. Éste es uno de los puntos discutibles: estando de acuerdo en la afirmación general que acabo de mencionar, no siempre todos los desarrollos son igualmente claros. Por ejemplo, los himnos sabáticos de Qumram probablemente son una prueba demasiado pequeña para mostrar la conexión entre «reino» y «pueblo» de Dios (135-136). A mi juicio tampoco se puede decir rotundamente que el tema del Pueblo de Dios sea el marco para la ética de 1 Te (145).

En este sentido se percibe una cierta tendencia del autor a disminuir la importancia del tema Cuerpo de Cristo en cuanto a la concepción eclesiológica paulina para favorecer su tesis sobre el Pueblo de Dios. Es absolutamente cierto que está fuera de lugar plantear una alternativa en la eclesiológica paulina entre los conceptos de Cuerpo de Cristo y Pueblo de Dios en contra de Käseman (*Römerbrief*, 324-325) (183). El primero de esos dos conceptos es ciertamente una imagen, como se ha dicho repetidas veces, o una «*‘leibliche’ Interpretation des In-Christus-Sein*» (182). No conviene contraponer imagen a realidad cuando Pablo, o cualquier otro autor, se refiere al campo «sobrenatural» (182). Sin entrar aquí en las complejidades del lenguaje religioso/teológico es de sobra conocido que no podemos pretender expresar adecuadamente las realidades sobrenaturales con conceptos y expresiones simplemente humanas, por sofisticadas que sean. Es uno de los casos en que es más obvia la aplicación de la analogía. Cuando Pablo habla de la Iglesia como Cuerpo de Cristo en las cartas indiscutiblemente auténticas, 1 Corintios y Romanos, pretende poner de relieve tanto la unión de los cristianos con el Señor Jesús como entre ellos mismos, a la vez que quiere subrayar la diversidad de funciones y carismas. Todo ello mediante los dones del Espíritu. Para hacerlo emplea la expresión mencionada que es imaginativa. Pero que se refiere a algo absolutamente real para él.

Un tema importante para el punto central de la Iglesia como Pueblo de Dios es el tratamiento paulino de los dos testamentos, como puede suponerse fácilmente, puesto que Pueblo de Dios y testamento/alianza son ideas fuertemente vinculadas en la tradición del AT. Es en Ga 4,21-31 donde Pablo menciona más explícitamente este punto, aunque con no pocas obscuridades e imprecisiones que se prestan a no pequeñas discusiones. En primer lugar vale la pena notar que esa perícopa es una tipología más que una alegoría (F. Pastor-Ramos, «Alegoría o tipología en Gal 4,21-31», *EstB*

34 [1975] 113-119) pero puede dejarse de lado ese aspecto que ciertamente no es fundamental en este momento. Por otra parte estoy plenamente de acuerdo con la interpretación de la perícopa que hace Kraus (238-246). Pero quizás se puede explicitar algo más. La idea básica es que Pablo concibe a «nosotros/vosotros» (Ga 4,26.28), como los hijos libres de Abraham tipificados en Isaac, en una figura colectiva contrapuesta al pacto del Sinai, una comunidad cuya madre es la Jerusalén de arriba. Lo más obvio es pensar que esta comunidad es la Iglesia. Pero Pablo no la designa con ese nombre sino más bien como «testamento». Puede pensarse que ese pacto es el pacto con Abraham (241), aunque no resulte tan evidente que se pueda hablar de un pacto con Abraham, sino más bien de promesa. Pero en todo caso el hecho de evocar la nueva comunidad cristiana con una figura que, de un modo u otro, es paralela al pacto del Sinai, donde es claro que el elemento «pueblo de Dios» es fundamental, nos permite prolongar la tipología e imaginar la iglesia, Jerusalén de arriba, comunidad de libres, como Pueblo de Dios. Lo cual confirmaría ulteriormente la tesis propuesta.

Tanto en Gálatas como en Romanos, y pese a los diferentes acentos que cada una de esas cartas tiene, algo emerge con claridad, y es que Pablo imagina a los cristianos como definitivo Pueblo de Dios. A mi modo de ver, en cambio, es menos relevante hasta qué punto piensa el Apóstol que Israel es, sigue siendo o deja de ser, Pueblo de Dios, es decir, uno de los temas del complejo pasaje de Ro 9-11.

En este punto hay algo digno de notarse: no cabe duda de que Pablo piensa sobre Israel en términos de elección y promesa divina. Moviéndonos con sus presupuestos podemos seguir sus razonamientos en esos capítulos de Romanos. También estamos en condiciones de comprender su argumentación de que las promesas divinas a Abraham y el consiguiente Pueblo de Dios que surge de ellas llega a su plenitud en Cristo y en la comunidad de Cristo con la iglesia. Pero esta concepción paulina de elección también habrá de matizarse.

Es interesante destacar el aspecto eclesiológico en muchos de los principales conceptos paulinos. Así puede verse en las consideraciones sobre «nueva creatura» (247-251, 255-261). Parece bastante claro que se trata de una de las denominaciones paulinas más características y profundas relativas a la condición del ser humano salvado. K. afirma que se trata de una realidad comunitaria y, aunque resulte discutible aceptar sin matices esa afirmación, no cabe duda de que este concepto, como el resto de los conceptos soteriológicos paulinos, está inmerso en una contexto eclesial, el cual efectivamente empalma con la consideración de la iglesia como Pueblo de Dios.

Algo parecido ocurre con el concepto clave de «justicia» de Dios. Este término se interpreta una vez más en el sentido de «Heilsmacht» de Dios, lo cual ha sido un importante avance en la comprensión del mismo (cfr. «Sünde und Gerechtigkeit in 2 Korinther 5,21», *Studies on 2 Corinthians* [eds. R. Bieringer-J. Lambrecht] [Leuven 1994] 501-505). Pero se matiza que esta justicia de Dios es una «realidad eclesiológica» (261), con lo cual nos encontramos con que una idea soteriológica paulina importante — aunque probablemente no la central en su concepción de la salvación como

se decía mayoritariamente hasta hace algún tiempo — se halla entroncada en el ambiente comunitario y sociosalvífico que es la iglesia.

Hay un punto no tan directamente eclesiológico sino soteriológico que conviene comentar. Kraus utiliza en diversas ocasiones (vg. 193 a propósito de 1 Cor 11,25; 257-261 sobre 2 Cor 5,17) la expresión «Stellvertretung» para interpretar el «por vosotros» referido a la muerte de Cristo como motivo soteriológico. A mi juicio caben formas de comprender y explicar el efecto salvador para los seres humanos que producen la muerte y resurrección de Cristo, sin necesidad de apelar a la substitución (F. Pastor-Ramos, *La salvación del hombre en la muerte y resurrección de Cristo* (Verbo Divino; Estella 1991) 55-60. Y en la misma línea no es tan evidente, siempre sobre 2 Cor 5,21, explicar el «hecho pecado» empleando la idea de «Sühnopfer» o «víctima expiatoria» (260), que plantea más problemas que los que quiere resolver (Pastor-Ramos, *La salvación*, 60-74).

Volviendo al tema principal es importante la aportación que supone el subrayar el tema del Pueblo de Dios en la eclesiología paulina. No se trata de un mero ejercicio de erudición, como puede fácilmente suponerse. El concepto de Pueblo de Dios ofrece un marco para un desarrollo no pequeño en la eclesiología paulina y ciertamente es más accesible en la actualidad que el más místico y misterioso de Cuerpo de Cristo. Pero, como ya he mencionado, siguiendo el pensamiento de esta obra, no tiene sentido contraponer ambas concepciones. Como el mismo Pablo enseña, ambas aportan sus respectivos matices para la comprensión de la comunidad cristiana.

Pero este punto debería también ser sometido a una cierta desmitologización, si queremos profundizar ulteriormente en las posibilidades que ofrece la teología paulina aun a riesgo de superar sus estrictos límites. De hecho Pablo ya da pie para este proceso porque no habla tan frecuentemente de la iglesia crisiana como pueblo elegido, aunque haya algunos indicios (113-114) y por otros rasgos importantes que han modificado decisivamente la concepción veterotestamentaria de Pueblo de Dios.

Aunque quizás sea una excesiva simplificación, cabe decir lo siguiente: en el AT el Pueblo de Dios se funda por el pacto sinaítico que incluye la elección de Israel por parte de Dios. Pablo no apela a este pacto ni parece pensar en la iglesia como continuadora de este pueblo, mucho menos en un sentido exclusivista. De hecho cuando en 2 Cor 6,16 recurre a la fórmula de la alianza la aplica a los gentiles. Por otra parte, siendo la Torah elemento fundamental del pacto sinaítico, teniendo en cuenta la teología paulina sobre la ley, es lógico que prescindiera de ese tipo de concepción sobre pueblo. Más bien habla de las promesas hechas por Dios a Abraham como base para concebir a la iglesia como Pueblo de Dios, tesis repetidamente mencionada en la obra que comentamos. Pero, si se consideran todos los aspectos que toca, el fundamento del nuevo Pueblo no es simplemente un acto divino de elección, unas promesas divinas hechas a Abraham y a su descendencia, sino el proceso salvador llevado a cabo en Cristo.

Nos encontramos así con que la concepción eclesiológica paulina, su idea del nuevo Pueblo de Dios, no arranca simplemente de un acto de elección divina, más o menos particularista o arbitrario, sino que se encuentra en

relación directa con toda la soteriología del Apóstol, bien sea que la ponga en relación con la justificación o con alguno de los otros modos en que expresa su soteriología. Subraya la dimensión comunitaria y social para no caer en un individualismo no paulino ni neotestamentario. Lo cual no significa ausencia o disminución de la gratuidad divina en relación con su Pueblo, sino una concepción más compleja y rica.

En resumen, creo que este libro destaca razonablemente una vez más el importante papel de lo comunitario y eclesiológico dentro de la concepción paulina, pero con unos matices, los de Pueblo de Dios, que la enriquecen en gran medida.

C/ Fernando el Católico 63
28015 Madrid (Spain)

Federico PASTOR-RAMOS

Paolo GARUTI, O.P., *Alle origini dell'omiletica cristiana: la lettera agli Ebrei. Note di analisi retorica* (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Analecta 38). Jerusalem, Franciscan Printing Press, 1995. VIII-439 p. 17 × 23,5. \$35.00

Two commonplaces characterize most of modern treatments of Hebrews: the work is a prime example of ancient rhetorical art and it displays an elaborate and carefully contrived structure. Fr. Garuti's impressively learned and imaginative monograph gives new meaning to the first and thereby undermines the second as it poses a significant challenge to structural analyses of the text.

Garuti divides his work into four chapters. He begins to show the relationship between Hebrews and ancient rhetoric with a survey of elementary rhetorical education in the first century C.E. Using parallels taken from the rhetorical *progymnasmata*, he illustrates how Hebrews employs the techniques of the rhetorical schools. Hermogenes advises budding orators how to analyze a narrative through declarations, questions, asyndetic repetitions of elements of the story or comparisons, techniques all attested in Hebrews. Hermogenes also gives advice on the use of chreiai and proverbs; Hebrews uses such elements, particularly in chapter 12. Hebrews provides a handbook example of encomium in its treatment of Melchizedek in chapter 7, and of characterization (*prosōpopoiia* and *eidōlopoiia*) as it sets the scene for words of God (1,6) and Christ (2,11; 10,5). The *Controversiae* and *Suasoriae* of Marcus Annaeus Seneca provide further insights into the rhetorical culture which Hebrews shared, while the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* affords categories that organize the rest of Garuti's work.

With his own preparatory exercise complete, Garuti offers a lengthy analysis of the *lexis* or "style" of Hebrews. He begins this discussion with a survey (34-57) of the development of rhetorical theory through the period of the early empire. Behind the opposition in the early empire between asianists and atticists stands a debate of longer duration between followers

of Theodoros and Apollodorus in the Hellenistic period. To the former camp belongs the anonymous *Peri Hypsous* ("On the Sublime"), which provides the key comparandum for Hebrews. Garuti then treats exhaustively the rhetorical devices that appear throughout Hebrews, techniques such as oaths, rhetorical questions, embellishments such as asyndeton, anaphora, hyperbaton; figures of speech including metaphors derived from various spheres, etc. Further comparisons between Hebrews, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Thucydides, and Plato follow. Garuti concludes this chapter with a consideration of prose rhythms, showing the preference of Hebrews for certain clausulae. This section updates, without his exaggerated claims, the work of F. Blass on prose rhythms in Hebrews. The whole analysis confirms the relative sophistication of the language of Hebrews and its association with the rhetorical traditions of Rhodes to which the anonymous "On the Sublime" belongs. More importantly for Garuti's larger project, it highlights discrepancies and tensions within the work at the level of its vocabulary and style.

Garuti's third chapter, analyzing the organization of the text, will no doubt be his most controversial. He recognizes that, at the text's surface, numerous structural indices, inclusio, catchwords, etc., of the kind that Albert Vanhoye and others have analyzed. He is not content, however, with the rhetorical structures that result from the analysis of such features. In searching for rhetorically adequate elements, exordium, propositio, narratio, argumentatio, etc., he begins by isolating several passages that could serve as exordia, appeals designed to render the auditor well disposed, attentive, and docile. Heb 1,1-4; 3,1-2 and 5,11-6,2 would all be suitable. A similar search for an epilogue yields complex results, a tripartite conclusion combining elements of the last two chapters. 12,14-17 introduces a note of indignation; 12,25a.26-29; 13,9b-15 offers an enumeration; 13,20-22 provide a greeting and doxology. The fact that each of these elements relates to specific portions of the body of Hebrews intimates the hypothesis that Garuti then develops. Analysis of the argumentative structures of Hebrews leads to the identification of three rhetorically coherent strands of the text. The first revolves around the theme of the "wandering people of God". The elements of this strand are 1,1-4; 2,1-4; 3,1-4,11; 10,38-11,38, with 11,39-40, probably a redactional addition, and 12,18-24.25b. The second strand, involving argumentation about Christ's priesthood, consists of 2,5-6a, which is possibly redactional, 2,6b-18; 5,1-10; 7,1-28; 10,1-18; 10,26-37; 12,1-3; 12,14-17; 13,20-21. The third strand, offering an independent development of the theme of priesthood, consists of 4,14-16, which is possibly redactional, 8,1-9,28; 10,19-25, possibly redactional, 12,25a.26-29, and 13,9b-15.16-17, the last two verses of which are possibly redactional. Not all passages in Hebrews are assigned to one of these three strands, since they involve commonplaces that could appear in any. Garuti's final chapter on *heuresis*, or the process of "invention", explores the development of certain key arguments. Here his concern is primarily the relationship between rhetorical traditions and philosophical schools. This leads, among other things, to a consideration of the Platonism of Hebrews. Garuti notes the difficulties occasioned by such vocabulary as

hypodeigma (Heb 4,11; 8,5; 9,23-24) and suggests that the tensions in the use of the term are the result of the different hands. He explores other arguments in Hebrews attending to their philosophical associations. His most perceptive contributions in this chapter involve his treatment of arguments about discrepancies between laws and critiques of existing laws.

In summarizing his results Garuti situates the strands of argumentation that he has isolated. He attributes the first two to a master homilist, who depends on Pauline thought and utilizes the common exemplum of the desert generation and its fate, particularly as sketched in Numbers 14. The concerns of the master in this homily are to argue, using conditional syllogisms characteristic of Stoicism, against an eschatological expectation too focused on political hopes and for a notion, influenced by Middle Platonism, of Christ enthroned in a transcendent world to which his followers are destined. The second strand focuses more specifically on the priesthood of Christ and the implications of that priesthood for the Law. The master in this homily, now using Platonic themes within a temporal framework (7,28; 10,1), points toward the fulfilment of divine promises in the reality of Christ. In treating the status of the Law, this homily also deploys modes of comparison characteristic of Epicurean rhetoricians and considerations in evidence in Cicero for dealing with conflicting laws. A second figure, responsible for the third strand of Hebrews, explains many anomalies. Garuti attributes that third strand to a redactor. His work is evident in the strongly dualistic comparisons of chapters 8 and 9; his concerns focus on the definition of the cultic space where Christ's sacrifice takes effect. The typology of the sacrifice of Yom Kippur is of special interest to him. He has a high Christology (4,15c) and his interest in Christ's passage through the heavens (4,14) or the "veil" (6,19; 10,20) is vaguely gnostic. Unlike his master, he is not particularly precise about citing the Old Testament. This redactor is responsible for the overall structure of Hebrews, but he was not the final hand to work on the text. The text's final shaper not only transformed it, at least superficially, into an epistle; he also added the cautionary passage of 5,11-6,12. In the hands of Garuti Hebrews thus becomes the work of a school, devoted to preserving and transmitting the insights of an homiletic master to Christians distant in time and space. Garuti's hypothesis has much to commend it. Hebrews is clearly a thematically complex work with elements that stand in serious tension. Most scholars who have wrestled with that complexity have entertained the possibility that Hebrews uses traditions from which some of the tensions result. Some have also suspected that well formed homiletic units, such as 3,1-4,13, may have served as building blocks for the text in its current form. Garuti's suggestion about the strata in Hebrews offers a systematic approach to the issues raised by such hypotheses about sources and traditions. Anyone who studies the structure of Hebrews and the logic of its arguments will have to take his work seriously and consider its challenge to the general assumption of the literary unity of the text, or at least of the bulk of the text.

While the challenge merits serious consideration, and may well point to an important diachronic element in the development of Hebrews, it is not clear that Garuti's hypothesis will provide a satisfactory solution to all the text's problems. For instance, the most plausible stratum is the first, the heart of

which are two well defined units with clear thematic connections, 3,1-4,11 and 10,38-11,38, although the limits of the latter unit are problematic. One could envisage a homily beginning with 3,1, continuing through a *propositio* and *argumentatio* in chaps.3 and 4, leading to an extended exhortation in chap.11 concluding with another warning in chap.12. Yet, the final pericope continuing the theme of the wandering people, 12,18-24.25b, resumes, in 12,24, the theme of the new covenant characteristic of stratum C (8,1-9,28), to which allusion is made in stratum B (7,22). Some of these connections across strata could be the work of a redactor, or continuity between two products of one rhetorical mind, but they could also be the work of a single creative mind producing a complex literary product.

Similarly, the passages isolated as the master's homily B cohere around the theme of Christ's priesthood. The heart of that strand consists of the connection between chapter 7 on the typology of Melchizedek, and chapter 10, which begins with the note that the law has but a shadow of the good things to come. Yet what immediately follows the opening of the chapter is a set of verses, 10,2-4, with a rich set of parallels to the immediately preceding chapters, supposedly the work of another hand. The sacrificial themes in 10,2-4 are, moreover, unparalleled within Garuti's stratum B. A redactor certainly could have extrapolated from the passing comment of a master about bulls and goats in 10,2-4, but is that the most persuasive hypothesis for the parallels?

Other similar problems could be noted with the units posited by Garuti. His thematic units overlap in odd ways. The greatest of these overlaps certainly occurs in chaps.8-10. Here elements of the surface structure, as well as the underlying thematic development, create an integrated literary unit with subtle plays on polar oppositions, heaven and earth, interior and external, new and old, all of which are, in a clever fashion, resolved in 10,1-18. Garuti would have that clever play be the work of two, tangentially related minds. That seems to me unlikely.

Garuti has pushed the rhetorical analysis of Hebrews where other scholars have not ventured to take it. In the process he has provided a new, comprehensive, and historically informed, analysis of the rhetorical elements of Hebrews. This in itself would be a major contribution to the analysis of this text. He has also posed with greater urgency the issue of the unity of the text and has forced all students of Hebrews to reconsider the process of the text's development. His notion that a senior homilist and his disciples may have had a hand in the development of the text is worth further exploration. In its current form it fails to persuade since it divides significant elements that clearly cohere and thus ignores a compositional integrity in the text.

Whether the unities in the text are the work of a master homilist or a secondary redactor, the literary character of Hebrews remains an enigma. Garuti's work highlights the difficulties of associating the work as a whole with any clearly defined rhetorical paradigm. That problem remains whether the composition is the work of one or many hands.

University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN 46556 (USA)

Harold W. ATTRIDGE

Giancarlo BIGUZZI, *I settenari nella struttura dell'Apocalisse. Analisi, storia della ricerca, interpretazione* (Supplementi alla Rivista Biblica 31). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1996. 411 p. 16,5 × 24. Lit. 57.000

Parmi les nombreux problèmes que pose l'Apocalypse, celui de son plan n'est pas le moindre: voici un livre qui classe et compte sans se lasser, mais lorsqu'on cherche à passer de cet ordre apparent à une organisation du propos, les difficultés commencent. Le livre de G. Biguzzi s'attaque à ce problème en partant des septénaires auxquels il reconnaît un rôle positivement structurant.

Quatre septénaires sont clairement identifiables: les lettres, les sceaux, les trompettes et les coupes. Cette simple énumération couvre les 16 premiers chapitres de l'Apocalypse. C'est dire l'intérêt qu'il y a à retrouver l'intention qui a présidé à ces groupements.

G. Biguzzi a la sagesse, et c'est assurément une grande vertu, de chercher à entrer dans la problématique en suivant les cheminements de l'histoire de l'exégèse. Il le fait avec un sérieux et une érudition admirables.

Le moindre mérite de cet exposé introductif n'est certes pas de nous rappeler que, dès la fin du 3ème siècle, Victorin, remarquant des parallèles entre des septénaires, inventait la théorie à laquelle s'attachera plus tard le nom de récapitulation. On regrettera que l'important travail de Martine Dulaey consacré au commentaire de Victorin ne soit pas pris en compte. L'explication qui propose de distinguer dans l'Apocalypse des présentations synchroniques est l'un des principes herméneutiques les plus fructueux de toute l'histoire de l'exégèse de l'Apocalypse.

Depuis le 17ème siècle une deuxième remarque s'est imposée: dans les trois derniers septénaires le septième élément joue un rôle particulier, car il semble contenir les développements ultérieurs. Ce fait est souvent expliqué par une théorie que l'on appelle l'englobement ou l'emboîtement.

Enfin on note qu'au sixième sceau et à la sixième trompette le texte marque un arrêt. Les développements qui trouvent là leur place (Apocalypse 7 et 10-11,14) posent un vrai problème aux exégètes qui parlent alors volontiers d'intermèdes, de digressions ou de parenthèses.

Les principales données étant ainsi magistralement présentées, l'auteur propose une analyse originale dont voici les principaux résultats en un résumé succinct qui doit renoncer à rendre justice aux rigoureuses démonstrations de l'auteur. Le septénaire des sceaux présente des spécificités qui le distinguent des deux septénaires suivants: c'est l'agneau qui ouvre tous les sceaux. Il s'agit donc chaque fois de révélations du Christ qui concernent le contenu du livre scellé, à savoir le plan de Dieu jusqu'au salut final. C'est donc une petite apocalypse complète qui s'achève à la fin du chapitre 7. Voilà pourquoi on n'y trouve pas que l'annonce de fléaux, témoin en est le cinquième sceau qui fait entendre le cri des martyrs demandant justice. Les quatre premiers sceaux (les cavaliers) révèlent les grandes constantes de l'histoire (une positive, trois négatives). Puis vient la question centrale posée par les martyrs: Dieu laisse-t-il régner les persécuteurs et leur abandonne-t-il les siens? La réponse ouvre sur toute l'histoire à venir: Dieu a son

plan. Il connaît son peuple, le marque de son sceau et le voit dans sa perfection céleste. Le septième sceau introduit alors un élément hétérogène. Ce n'est pas un hasard: le même phénomène se distingue dans les septénaires suivants. C'est ce que G. Biguzzi appelle la règle du septième élément englobant parce qu'il annonce et semble contenir en puissance la suite du développement. En l'occurrence, à l'ouverture du septième sceau il se fait un silence qui exprime l'attente universelle à quoi répondra toute la suite introduite par les sept anges aux trompettes.

Ainsi, aux révélations prophétiques délivrées par le Christ, répondent les accomplissements historiques que Dieu réalise et qui sont l'objet des deux septénaires suivants. Ils reprennent donc, sur un autre plan, le message des sceaux en annonçant les châtements réservés aux persécuteurs.

On insiste souvent, à juste titre, sur les parallèles entre les trompettes et les coupes. Mais G. Biguzzi montre de manière convaincante qu'il n'y a pas simple répétition: les trompettes s'en prennent de manière toute traditionnelle à l'idolâtrie, tandis que les coupes dénoncent un nouveau visage plus menaçant de l'idolâtrie qui s'incarne dans la réalité politico-religieuse de l'empire et du culte impérial.

Comme après le sixième sceau on trouvait la révélation du plan de Dieu pour les siens, (Apocalypse 7), après la septième trompette les chapitres 10 et 11 esquissent un nouveau départ: avant d'aborder les révélations sur les bêtes sataniques, le voyant affirme que devant la forme nouvelle et particulièrement redoutable que prend l'idolâtrie, Dieu va susciter des prophètes comme jadis Moïse et Élie, et Jean lui-même est appelé à prophétiser. Cette structure singulière ne peut être fortuite: elle détermine le dynamisme du texte. Pour bien l'appréhender, il faut prêter attention à la manière dont l'Apocalypse parle du temps: les 21 moments indiqués par les trois septénaires ne désignent pas des durées mais des instants qui peuvent introduire tout un développement événementiel. En revanche, les trois malheurs annoncés par le voyant décrivent des temps continus. C'est ainsi que le troisième malheur dure tout le temps que se succèdent les sept coupes.

L'Apocalypse suit donc un plan à la fois clair et simple: après la vision du Christ pascal et les sept Lettres, s'ouvre la deuxième partie qui comprend les chapitres 4 à 22. On y distingue trois paragraphes: (1) La révélation de l'agneau (le livre aux sept sceaux). (2) L'annonce de l'intervention punitive et curative de Dieu contre l'idolâtrie traditionnelle (les trompettes), puis contre l'idolâtrie nouvelle (les coupes). (3) La description du verdict final et de la Jérusalem nouvelle. On constate que tous ces développements s'ordonnent pour apporter la réponse de Dieu aux interrogations des fidèles en butte aux persécutions: les châtements tombent sur les persécuteurs; quant aux chrétiens, ils forment le peuple de Dieu et assument dans le monde la mission prophétique qui les dresse contre Satan et ses créatures.

Le livre de G. Biguzzi présente une analyse littéraire conduite avec une rigueur et une méthode impressionnantes. L'érudition sur laquelle s'appuie le travail est toujours remarquable. Les conclusions, fermes et claires, commandent toute l'interprétation de l'Apocalypse. C'est dire l'importance et les mérites de ce beau travail.

Il n'emporte pourtant pas toujours la conviction et appelle une discussion qui ne peut être ici qu'esquissée. Nous avons loué les vertus de l'analyse rigoureuse. Il n'y a pas à y revenir. Mais peut-être est-on en droit de demander à celui qui met si bien en œuvre une méthode systématique de justifier son choix: ne faudrait-il pas commencer en se posant la question de l'adéquation d'une semblable méthode à l'analyse d'un texte comme l'Apocalypse? En effet, on nous présente un plan construit selon les principes d'une logique sans défaut. Or, il est tout de même troublant de relever dans le texte des indices nombreux et convergents qui tendent à montrer que l'auteur n'a pas cherché à bâtir un édifice équilibré selon les meilleures lois de l'architecture littéraire.

Nous nous bornerons à citer quelques uns de ces indices: pourquoi l'auteur annonce-t-il trois malheurs et puis, après avoir décrit les deux premiers, oublie-t-il tout à fait de parler du troisième? Pourquoi les deux derniers septénaires présentent-ils des parallèles si flagrantes? Peut-on se satisfaire d'une analyse qui voit dans Apocalypse 21,1-8 une conclusion aux chapitres consacrés aux différentes phases du jugement? Arrêtons-nous un instant sur ce point. Il est très juste de noter que le châtement atteint les ennemis dans l'ordre inverse de celui de leur apparition dans les chapitres antérieurs: Babylone, les bêtes et les rois, le dragon, la mort. Ceci rend bien compte des chapitres 17 à 20. Mais 21,1-8 n'est pas, en guise de conclusion, l'annonce anticipée de la Jérusalem nouvelle. C'est plutôt le premier tableau d'un triptyque qui décrit l'achèvement de tout en recourant successivement à trois images traditionnellement employées dans les prophéties eschatologiques de l'Ancien Testament: le monde nouveau (21,1-8); la Jérusalem nouvelle (21,9-27); le paradis (22,1-5). Or, ces trois volets ont été peints par quelqu'un qui avait le souci de parsemer son œuvre d'indices qui montrent l'unité fondamentale de cette triple description. C'est ainsi que Jérusalem apparaît déjà dans le monde nouveau en une allusion (21,2) dont les mots sont littéralement repris en 21,10. Et la phrase embarrassée de 22,2 ne s'explique que par la volonté d'indiquer que le jardin paradisiaque n'est pas une réalité différente de la ville sainte. On relèvera encore le parallélisme appuyé entre 21,23.25 et 22,5. L'auteur de l'Apocalypse semble donc multiplier à plaisir les signes qui indiquent que le fil de sa composition ne suit pas un plan ordinaire de structure linéaire. C'est pourquoi il suggère, en soulignant les parallèles, qu'il ne faut pas se laisser abuser par le déroulement d'un plan qu'il brise toujours à nouveau.

G. Biguzzi argumente fort justement à propos du rouleau dont la logique élémentaire fait repousser l'ouverture à la rupture du dernier sceau qui le maintient fermé. Il affirme avec raison que la révélation commence dès que le premier sceau est brisé, et il s'insurge contre ceux qui veulent couler la vision dans le moule rigide d'un exposé systématique. Il a cent fois raison, mais peut-être faut-il élargir la portée de cette remarque à l'ensemble de l'Apocalypse. On est alors amené à se poser la très ancienne question du pourquoi de ces procédés: pourquoi l'auteur recourt-il si régulièrement aux parallèles, aux renvois, aux anticipations et aux emboîtements? La réponse ne devrait-elle pas être cherchée dans la direction suggérée plus haut: ce sont là autant de signes destinés à mettre en garde contre une lecture «apo-

calyptique» de l'Apocalypse. Ils rappellent que les mots et les images employés ne sont que des approximations successives qui veulent exprimer dans un langage humain un message décidément transcendant: l'achèvement du processus d'inhabitation de Dieu dans le monde et l'irruption du royaume éternel dans le temps des hommes. Certes, ces différentes expressions ne sont pas de vaines répétitions: G. Biguzzi a brillamment dégagé la spécificité des septénaires des trompettes et des coupes malgré leurs parallélisme appuyés. L'exemple est particulièrement démonstratif: les deux passages ont même intention, on pourrait même dire même objet: condamner l'idolâtrie. Mais le point de vue change. Le deuxième exposé se fait plus précis et sa prophétie plus interpellante lorsqu'elle dévoile le dernier visage de Satan.

Si ces remarques sont justes, la recherche du plan de l'Apocalypse ne devrait pas trop se préoccuper de discerner l'organisation du texte (et après tout, comment oublier qu'on s'y essaie depuis bientôt 20 siècles sans qu'un plan se soit jamais imposé!), mais chercher, comme l'a si bien fait G. Biguzzi, à dégager le message spécifique de chacune des parties que l'auteur a si nettement distinguées. L'entreprise est moins enthousiasmante que celle qui vise à dominer le livre pour en appréhender la structure d'un regard synthétique, mais elle permet peut-être de pénétrer au cœur même du message prophétique. À celui qui tente cette démarche, le livre de G. Biguzzi fournira de très précieuses indications, des résultats importants et l'exemple d'un travail mené d'irréprochable façon.

Rue Pantaléon-Mury, 8
F-67000 Strasbourg

Pierre PRIGENT

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

The following list mentions all the books on biblical and related studies sent recently to *Biblica*, including those which may not actually be reviewed in this journal. Inclusion of a book in the list is no indication of an editorial opinion concerning it.

Books sent to this journal will not be returned to the senders, even if no review of them is published in it, unless sent at the request of the editors of *Biblica*.

Books, articles and offprints from periodicals sent to *Biblica* will be made available to the editor of the *Elenchus of Biblical Bibliography*.

Please address all books, correspondence, etc., to: Editorial Office, *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della pilotta, 25, I-00187 Rome, Italy.

Ammassari, Antonio (a cura di), *Il vangelo di Luca nella colonna latina del Bezae Codex Cantabrigensis*. Note di commento sulla struttura letteraria, la punteggiatura, le lezioni e le citazioni bibliche. Città del Vaticano, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996. 239 p. 17 × 24. Lit. 27.000

Ammassari, Antonio (a cura di), *Il vangelo di Marco nella colonna latina del Bezae Codex Cantabrigensis*. Note di commento sulla struttura letteraria, la punteggiatura, le lezioni e le citazioni bibliche. Città del Vaticano, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1966. 239 p. 17 × 24. Lit. 24.000

Ammassari, Antonio (a cura di), *Il vangelo di Matteo nella colonna latina del Bezae Codex Cantabrigensis*. Note di commento sulla struttura letteraria, la punteggiatura, le lezioni e le citazioni bibliche. Città del Vaticano, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996. 239 p. 17 × 24. Lit. 32.000

Amsler, Frédéric – Bovon, François – Bouvier, Bertrand, *Actes de l'apôtre Philippe*. Introduction, traduction et notes (Apocryphes 8). Turnhout, Brepols, 1996. 318 p. 12 × 19

Apponius, *Commentaire sur le Cantique des Cantiques* (Livres I-III). Introduction générale, texte, traduction et notes par **Bernard de Vregille** et **Louis Neyrand** (SC 420). Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1997. 386 p. 12,5 × 19,5. FF 261

Bartelt, Andrew H., *The Book around Immanuel*. Style and Structure in Isaiah 2–12 (Biblical and Judaic Studies 4). Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 1996. xi-287 p. 16 × 23,5. \$32.50

Bauer, Johannes B., *Studien zu Bibeltext und Väterexegese*. Hrsg. von Anneliese Felber (SBAB 23 NT). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1997. 288 p. 14,5 × 20,5. DM 79 – ÖS 577 – SFr 75,—

Beeching, Paul Q., *Awkward Reverence*. Reading the New Testament Today. New York, The Continuum Publishing Company, 1997. 246 p. 16 × 23,5. \$24.95

Bolin, Thomas M., *Freedom Beyond Forgiveness*. The Book of Jonah Re-Examined. (JSOTSS 236 – Copenhagen International Seminar 3). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1997. 217 p. 16 × 24. £35.00 – \$50.00

Bori, Pier Cesare (a cura di), *In Spirito e Verità*. Letture di Giovanni 4,23-24 (Epifania della Parola 6). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1996. 336 p. 17,5 × 24. Lit. 40.000

Bovon, François, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 9,51–14,35)* (Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament III/2). Zürich – Düsseldorf, Benziger Verlag – Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener Verlag, 1996. VIII-556 p. 16,5 × 24

Bovon, François, *L'Évangile selon saint Luc (9,51 – 14,35)* (Commentaire du Nouveau Testament IIIb). Genève, Labor et Fides, 1996. 492 p. 17,5 × 23,5. SFr 78,—

Bremmer, Jan N. (ed.), *The Apocryphal Acts of Paul and Thecla* (Studies on the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles 2). Kampen, Kok Pharos, 1996. VIII-210 p. 15 × 23. Dfl 59,80

Carmichael, Calum M., *The Story of Creation*. Its Origin and Its Interpretation in Philo and the Fourth Gospel. Ithaca, NY – London, Cornell University Press, 1996. XII-136 p. 14,5 × 22,5. £19.50

Clarke, Kent D., *Textual Optimism*. A Critique of the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (JSNTSS 138). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1997. 350 p. 16 × 24. £47.50 – \$70.00

Clines, D. J. A. (ed.), *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Volume III: *zain-teth*. Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 424 p. 20 × 25,5. £65.00 – \$100.00

Court, John M., *Reading the New Testament* (New Testament Readings). London, Routledge, 1997. XIV-170 p. 14 × 21,5. Hardback: £35.00; paperback: £10.99

Creach, Jerome F. D., *Yahweh as Refuge and the Editing of the Hebrew Psalter* (JSOTSS 217). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 156 p. 16 × 24. £35.00 – \$55.00

Dalla Vecchia, Flavio (ed.), *Ridattare i Vangeli?* (Giornale di Teologia 247). Brescia, Queriniana, 1997. 218 p. 12 × 19,5. Lit. 28.000

Davies, Philip R. (ed.), *The Prophets*. A Sheffield Reader (The Biblical Seminar 42). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 388 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £14.95 – \$19.95

Dion, P. E., *Les Araméens à l'âge du fer: histoire politique et structure sociales* (EB 34). Paris, Gabalda et Cie, Éditeurs, 1997. 472 p. 16 × 24. FF 390

Dobbeler, Stephanie von, *Die Bücher 1/2 Makkabäer* (Neuer Stuttgarter Kommentar – Altes Testament 11). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1997. 271 p. 13 × 20. DM 48 – OS 350 – SFr 46—

Dohmen, Christoph, *Schöpfung und Tod*. Die Entfaltung theologischer und anthropologischer Konzeptionen in Gen 2/3. Aktualisierte Neuauflage (SBB 35). Stuttgart, Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1996. 366 p. 14,5 × 20,5. DM 89 – ÖS 650 – SFr 85,—

Dos Santos Vaz, Armindo, *A visão das origens em Génesis 2,4b–3,23*. Coerência temática e unidade literária. Lisboa, Edições Didaskalia – Paço de Arcos, Edições Carmelo, 1996. 605 p. 16 × 24

Dürr, Hans-Peter, Giovanni Luzzi (1856-1948), traduttore della Bibbia e teologo ecumenico. Traduzione di Marina Sartorio Cunz (Collana della Facoltà Valdese di Teologia 19). Torino, Editrice Claudiana, 1996. 270 p. 16,5 × 23,5. Lit. 39.000

Evans, Craig A. – Porter, Stanley E. (eds.), *New Testament Backgrounds*. A Sheffield Reader (The Biblical Seminar 43). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1997. 335 p. 15,5 × 3,5. £14.95 – \$19.95

Evans, Craig A. – Porter, Stanley E. (eds.), *New Testament Text and Language*. A Sheffield Reader (The Biblical Seminar 44). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1997. 306 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £14.95 – \$19.95

Exum, J. Cheryl, *Plotted, Shot, and Painted*. Cultural Representations of Biblical Women (JSOTSS 215 – Gender, Culture, Theory 3). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 260 p. 16 × 24. Cloth: £40.00 – \$60.00; paper: £14.95 – \$18.00

Fernández López, Maria Concepción, Sidonio Apolinar, humanista de la antigüedad tardía; su correspondencia (Antigüedad y cristianismo. Monografías históricas sobre la antigüedad tardía 11). Murcia, Universidad, Área de Historia Antigua, 1994. 432 p. 17 × 24. Ptas 5.000 – \$50.00

Ferraro, Giuseppe, *Il Paraclito, Cristo, il Padre nel quarto Vangelo*. Città del Vaticano, Libreria Vaticana, 1996. 196 p. 17 × 24. Lit. 29.000

Fields, Weston W., *Sodom and Gomorrah*. History and Motif in Biblical Narrative (JSOTSS 231). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1997. 228 p. 16 × 24. £40.00 – \$60.00

Frede, Hermann Josef – Stanjek, Herbert, *Sedulii Scotti collectaneum in Apostolum*. I. In *Epistolam ad Romanos* (Vetus Latina. Aus der Geschichte der altlateinischen Bibel 31). Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 1966. 57*-346 p. 16 × 24

Fritz, Volkmar, *Studien zur Literatur und Geschichte des Alten Israels* (SBAB 22 AT). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1997. 296 p. 14,5 × 20,5. DM 79 – ÖS 577 – SFr 75,—

Fusco, Vittorio, *Le prime comunità cristiane*. Tradizioni e tendenze nel cristianesimo delle origini (La Bibbia nella storia 19). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1996. 305 p. 14 × 21,5. Lit. 38.000

Gafini, Isaiah M., *Land, Center and Diaspora*. Jewish Constructs in Late Antiquity (JSPSS 21). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1997. 136 p. 16 × 24. £25.00 – \$40.00

Garrison, Roman, *The Graeco-Roman Context of Early Christian Literature* (JSNTSS 137). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1997. 123 p. 16 × 24. £24.50 – \$35.00

Garrow, A.J.P., *Revelation* (New Testament Readings). London – New York, Routledge, 1997. x-140 p. 14 × 21,5. Hardback: £35.00; paperback: £12.99

Gil, Moshe, *A History of Palestine, 634-1099*. Translated from the Hebrew by Ethel Broido. Cambridge, University Press, 1997. xxvi-968 p. 15,5 × 22,5. £27.95

Goodacre, Mark S., *Goulder and the Gospels*. An Examination of a New Paradigm (JSNTSS 133). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 416 p. 16 × 24. £47.50 – \$70.00

Goulder, Michael D., *The Psalms of Asaph and the Pentateuch*. Studies in the Psalter, III. (JSOTSS 233). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1997. 378 p. 16 × 24. £47.50 – \$70.00

Graham, M. Patrick – Hoglund, Kenneth G. – McKenzie, Steven L. (eds.), *The Chronicler as Historian* (JSOTSS 238). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1997. 336 p. 16 × 24. £40.00 – \$60.00

Grelot, Pierre, *Jésus de Nazareth, Christ et Seigneur*. Une lecture de l'Évangile. Tome 1 (LD 167). Paris, Éditions du Cerf – Montréal, Novalis, 1997. 473 p. 13,5 × 21,5. FF 220

Groß, Walter, *Die Satzteilfolge im Verbalsatz alttestamentlicher Prosa*. Untersucht an den Büchern Dtn, Ri und 2Kön. Unter Mitarbeit von Andreas Diße und Andreas Michel (FAT 17). Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1996. xvi-464 p. 17,5 × 23,5. DM 178,—

Halpern, Baruch, *The First Historians*. The Hebrew Bible and History. Paperback Edition. University Park, Pennsylvania University Press, 1996. xv-285 p. 15,5 × 23,5. \$19.95 – £17.95

Hammond Bammel, Caroline P., *Origeniana et Rufiniana* (Vetus latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 29). Freiburg im Breisgau, Verlag Herder, 1996. 254 p. 16 × 24

Hannah, Darell D., *The Text of I Corinthians in the Writings of Origen* (The New Testament in the Greek Fathers 4). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1997. xi-308 p. 15 × 22. \$44.95

Harris, Scott L., *Proverbs 1–9. A Study of Inner-Biblical Interpretation* (SBLDS 150). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1995. xii-193 p. 15 × 22,5. \$49.95

Hooker, Morna D., *The Signs of a Prophet*. The Prophetic Actions of Jesus. London, SCM Press, 1997. x-131 p. 13,5 × 21,5. £9.95

Hübner, Hans, *Teologia biblica del Nuovo Testamento*. Volume I: *Prolegomeni*. (Supplementi al commentario teologico del Nuovo Testamento 5). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1997. 323 p. 15,5 × 23. Lit. 51.000

Knight, Jonathan, *Disciples of the Beloved One*. The Christology, Social Setting and Theological Context of the Ascension of Isaiah (JSPSS 18). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 354 p. 14,5 × 22,5. £43.00 – \$64.00

Lacroix, Xavier, *Il corpo di carne*. La dimensione etica, estetica e spirituale dell'amore (Persona e psiche). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1996. 336 p. 14 × 21,5. Lit. 42.000

LaSor, William Sanford – Hubbard, David Allan – Bush, Frederic William (eds.), *Old Testament Survey*. The Message, Form, and Background of The Old Testament. Second Edition. Grand Rapids, W. B. Eerdmans, 1996. xvii-860 p. 17,5 × 25. \$40.00 – £28.00

Loretz, Oswald, *Des Gottes Einzigartigkeit*. Ein altorientalisches Argumentationsmodell zum »Schma Jisrael«. Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1997. x-204 p. 14 × 22. DM 68 – SFr 62 – ÖS 496,—

Manzi, Franco, *Melchisedek e l'angelologia nell'Epistola agli Ebrei e a Qumran* (AnBib 136). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1997. xvii-433 p. 16,5 × 24. Lit. 52.000 – \$37.00

Martin, Seán Charles, *«Pauli Testamentum»*. 2 Timothy and the Last Words of Moses (Tesi Gregoriana. Serie Teologia 18). Roma, Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1997. 305 p. 17 × 24. Lit. 32.000 – \$23.00

Meisinger, Hubert, *Liebesgebot und Altruismusforschung*. Ein exegetischer Beitrag zum Dialog zwischen Theologie und Naturwissenschaft (NTOA 33). Freiburg, Schweiz, Universitätsverlag – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996. 320 p. 16 × 23,5. Sfr 98 – DM 122 – ÖS 894,—

Moatti-Fine, Jacqueline, *Jésus (Josué)*. Traduction du texte grec de la Septante, introductions et notes (La Bible d'Alexandrie 6). Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1996. 258 p. 14 × 20

Morla Asensio, Víctor, *Libri sapienziali e altri scritti*. Edizione italiana a cura di Antonio Zani (Introduzione allo studio della Bibbia 5). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1997. 430 p. 15,5 × 23. Lit. 67.000

Mullen, Roderic L., *The New Testament of Cyril of Jerusalem* (The New Testament in the Greek Fathers 7). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1997. XIV-431 p. 15 × 22. \$39.95

Nodet, Étienne, *A Search for the Origins of Judaism*. From Joshua to the Mishnah. Translated by Ed Crowley (JSOTSS 248). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1997. 423 p. 16,5 × 24. £45.00 – \$65.00

Porter, Stanley E. – **Hayes, Michael A.** – **Tombs, David** (eds.), *Images of Christ*. Ancient and Modern (Roehampton Institute London Papers 2). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1997. 406 p. 16 × 24. Cloth: £45.00 – \$74.00; paper: £16.95 – \$28.00

Price, Robert M., *The Widow Traditions in Luke-Acts*. A Feminist-Critical Scrutiny (SBLDS 155). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1997. XLI-241 p. 14,5 × 22. \$29.95

Provan, Iain W., *1 & 2 Kings* (OTG). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1997. 125 p. 14 × 21,5. £6.95 – \$9.95

Reed, Jeffrey T., *A Discourse Analysis of Philippians*. Method and Rhetoric in the Debate over Literary Integrity (JSNTSS 136). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1997. 525 p. 16 × 24. £55.00 – \$80.00

Richard de Saint-Victor, *Les Douze Patriarches (Benjamin minor)*. Texte critique et traduction par Jean Châtillon et Monique Duchet-Suchaux, introduction, notes et index par Jean Longère (SC 419). Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1997. 374 p. 12,5 × 19,5. FF 199

Richardson, Peter, *Herod*. King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans (Studies on Personalities of the New Testament). Columbia, University of South Carolina Press, 1996. xxv-360 p. 16 × 23,5. \$34.95

Rogerson, John W. (ed.), *Industrial Mission in a Changing World*. Papers from the Jubilee Conference of the Sheffield Industrial Mission. Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 195 p. 16 × 24. Cloth: £15.00 – \$19.95; paper: £13.95 – \$19.95

Rohrhirsch, Ferdinand, *Wissenschaftliche Theorie und Qumran*. Die Geltungsbegründungen von Aussagen in der Biblischen Archäologie am Beispiel von Chirbet Qumran und En Feschcha (NTOA 32). Freiburg Schweiz, Universitätsverlag – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1996. XII-408 p. 16 × 23,5. SFr 110 – DM 132 – ÖS 964,—

Sawyer, John F.A. (ed.), *Reading Leviticus*. A Conversation with Mary Douglas (JSOTSS 227). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 290 p. 16 × 24. £45.00 – \$65.00

Sigrist, Marcel (éd.), *Études égyptologiques et bibliques à la mémoire du Père B. Couroyer* (Cahiers de la Revue Biblique 36). Paris, J. Gabalda, 1997. 123 p. 16 × 24. FF 140

Silbermann, Neil Asher – Small, David (eds.), *The Archaeology of Israel. Constructing the Past, Interpreting the Present* (JSOTSS 237). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1997. 350 p. 16 × 24. £45.00 – \$65.00

Simian-Yofre, Horacio, *La Chiesa dell'Antico Testamento. Costituzione, crisi e speranza della comunità credente dell'Antico Testamento* (Teologia viva 21). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1996. 175 p. 14 × 21,5. Lit. 22.000

Simoens, Yves, *Selon Jean*. I. Une traduction. 2–3. Une interpretation (Collection Institut d'Études Théologiques 17). Bruxelles, Éditions de l'Institut d'Études Théologiques, 1997. 99 et 1013 p. 16 × 24

Ska, Jean Louis, *Le passage de la mer*. Étude de la construction, du style et de la symbolique d'Ex 14,1-31. Deuxième édition revue et corrigée (AnBib 109). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1997. 204 p. 16,5 × 24. Lit. 46.000

Standaert, Benoît, *L'évangile selon Marc*. Commentaire. Deuxième édition, revue et augmentée (Lire la Bible 112). Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1997. 207 p. 11,5 × 18. FF 120

Stanton, Graham, *Parole d'évangile? Un éclairage nouveau sur Jésus et les évangiles*. Traduit de l'anglais par Jean Prignaud (L'histoire à vif). Paris, Éditions du Cerf - Montréal, Novalis, 1997. 252 p. 14 × 21,5. FF 144

Stevenson, Kalinda Rose, *The Version of Transformation. The Territorial Rhetoric of Ezekiel 40–48* (SBLDS 154). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1996. xxiv-192 p. 14 × 21,5. Cloth: \$39.95; paper: \$24.95

Supplément au dictionnaire de la Bible, sous la direction de Jacques **Briend** et Édouard **Cothenet**. Fascicule 70: Sexualité – Sichem. Paris, Letouzey & Ané, Éditeurs, 1996. Col. 1025-1280. 20 × 28. FF 352

Supplément au dictionnaire de la Bible, sous la direction de Jacques **Briend** et Édouard **Cothenet**. Fascicule 71: Sichem – Songe. Paris, Letouzey & Ané, Éditeurs, 1996. Col. 1281-1544. 20 × 28. FF 345

Trocme, Étienne, *L'enfance du Christianisme*. Paris, Éditions Noësis, 1997. 216 p. 14 × 22,5. FF 130

Turner, Max, *Power from on High. The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts* (Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 9). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 511 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £30.00 – \$45.00

Vaux, Roland de, *Die Ausgrabungen von Qumran und En Feschcha*. IA. *Die Grabungstagebücher*. Deutsche Übersetzung und Informationsaufbereitung durch Ferdinand **Rohrhirsch** und Bettina **Hofmeir** (NTOA Series Archaeologica 1A). Freiburg Schweiz, Universitätsverlag – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996. xii-230 p. 24,5 × 32,5. SFr 90 – DM 108 – ÖS 799,—

Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. 12 (Paris II). *Esaias*. Fascicule 8. Is 54,14–58,7. Ed. Roger **Gryson**. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 1996. pp. 1361-1440. 24 × 32

Vetus latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. 21. *Epistula ad Romanos.* 1. Lieferung: Einleitung. Hrsg. Hugo S. Eymann. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 1996. 80 p. 24 × 32

Wenham, Gordon J., *Numbers* (OTG). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1997. 130 p. 14 × 21,5. £6.95 – \$9.95

Zerwick, Maximiliano, *El griego del Nuevo Testamento* (Instrumentos de trabajo para el estudio de la Biblia II). Estella, Editorial Verbo Divino, 1997. 229 p. 15,5 × 23

ISSN 0006-0887

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa



Associato all'Unione Stampa Periodica Italiana

Finito di stampare l'11 luglio 1997
 Tipografia Poliglotta della Pontificia Università Gregoriana
 Piazza della Pilotta, 4 – 00187 Roma